A MODEST
ANSWER
TO
Dr. *STILLINGFLEET'S*
IRENICUM:

By a Learned Pen.

Sed hoc quidem affirmare non vereor, quod heu nimium triſtis Experientia jampridem docuit, ſenſim inter eodem & pari munere ſacro fungentes, ordinem Divinum, in gradum humanum, & hunc gradum, ruptis verorum purorum Canonum vinculis, in tyrannidem manifeſtam, &, ſi reſtitutam Eccleſiam malumus, abolendam evaſiſſe. Theod. Bezæ Reſp. *ad* Sarav. *de* Miniſtr. Evang. grad. cap. 15. *à calce.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Richard Janeway* in *Queens-Head*-Alley in *Pater-noſter*-Row, 1680.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THe Reader is desired to Correct the Mistake of the Printer, in calling so Reverend an Antagonist by the name of Mr. *Stillingfleet*, instead of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in so great a part of the Book. And as for an Epistle, though there was one provided by another hand, yet an accident preventing its Publishing with the Book, the Writer thereof is much better satisfied, on second thoughts, with its suppression: finding it no easie matter to say any thing worthy of the renowned Author; and so Learned a Work, that hath had the perusal and approbation

of as worthy and skilful Divines in the Controverſie of Church-Government, as are of their Age. *Judicium ſit penes lectorem.*

Animadver-

Animadverſions on Dr. Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, &c.

CHAP. I.

THIS Book, though ſet off with the ſpecious Title of an *Irenicum*, and carrying in its Face the pretence of a Laudable Deſign, *viz.* the healing of the dangerous Wounds and ſad Diviſions of the Church at this time prevailing, will, upon due Examination, I ſuppoſe, be found an unſuitable Salve for theſe Sores, and to mend our rents, as they ſay *Tinkers* do, by making a greater rent inſtead of mending a leſſer. For inſtead of a Debate about particular Forms of Government, it bringeth in another Debate, whether there be any Form inſtituted of Chriſt, whether we muſt ſearch the will of Chriſt about managing Church-Affaires in his Word, or be content with what is the will of man? Which Controverſie is like to be harder in determining, and more ſtiffly agitated than the other; for ſure it is harder to perſwade them, who would take the word of God for their rule, that *Chriſt hath not appointed any one Form of Government in his Houſe*, than that *he hath not appointed this or that.* By this device we are caſt looſe of all hold where we may fix, and there ſhall be no end of Contention, at leaſt among them, who conſult ſo as to determine ſome one Form of all theſe, which are thought to be lawful; and when they have determined, the People, on whom they impoſe it, have a very unſure bottom to ſettle their Conſciences upon in this matter, that doth ſo nearly concern Religion,

gion, to wit, nothing but the Judgment and Will of man, which is often wrong, and led by Intereſt, and at beſt is fallible and cannot guide us certainly in that, which pleaſeth God. Wherefore this Authors Opinion ſeems to be a cutting of the knot with *Alexander*, and caſting all looſe, when he cannot ſo untie it, as to hold faſt the exerciſe of Chriſt's Kingly Power in Governing his Church. Neither is this Opinion new, as the Author ſeemeth to imply; for it was long ſince maintained, and largely propugned by Mr. *Hooker* in his *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, and ſolidly refuted by Mr. *Rutherford* in his *Divine Right of Church-Government*; and indeed hath always been and ſtill is the main Pillar to uphold Epiſcopacy in theſe Nations, it being the moſt ready and plauſible way for them, who would wreath this Iron Yoke on the Necks of their Brethren, when they cannot ſhew them Chriſt's Authority for it, to take the determining of the Caſe out of his hand, and to put it in the hand of the King, and then to preſs it from his Authority with Fire and Sword. And indeed this Opinion is a moſt colourable excuſe for the unfaithful complyance of them, who would fain hold their places under any Form of Church-Government, that ſhall lye uppermoſt; for ſo they ſhall be ſure never to croſs Authority, and not to croſs the Intereſt of their own Back and Belly; and how much miſchief this piece hath done this way, is too evident; ſeeing men, that incline to comply, are ſatisfyed with ſhadows inſtead of ſubſtantial reaſon, to put off troubleſome Conſcience. Yet among them, who are conſcientiouſly zealous for any one way of Government, I ſuppoſe, the Lot of this Author will be that, which is ordinary to ſuch unhappy Peace-Makers, as ſell truth, or ſome part of it by an over-reach of condeſcendency, and that in Gods matters, not their own, (in which we muſt bargain as hard Merchants do in worldly things,) to redeem peace; for I ſuppoſe men of all perſwaſions will be about his Ears: For that which I am perſwaded to

be

be the truth of God in point of Church-Government, *viz.* *Government by Miniſters acting in parity, and ruling Elders met in Congregational, Claſſical, Provincial and National Presbyteries or Aſſemblies*; it is more eaſily upheld againſt his undermining Engines, than any of the other Forms; for the leaſt of his Book is levelled againſt it in particular and what he ſaith againſt it, I hope, will appear not to have great ſtrength; yea, I believe, that out of what he hath ſaid, this truth may be ſtrongly confirmed; which I ſhall thus eſſay in a word. He acknowledgeth and ſtifly maintaineth, that *Chriſt hath given power, not only of teaching, but of ruling his Church, to all and every one of his Miniſters; and that he hath not given more power to one of them than another, nor made them ſubject or ſubordinate to one another.* Whence it clearly followeth that *Presbyterian Government* (I mean the parity of Miniſters and their Aſſociation) is *jure divino, ex confeſſo*; and that Prelacy is an addition to it, made *jure humano.* And hence it followeth, that this addition is unlawful, except he can prove that Chriſt hath given a power to men to make them unequal, whom he hath made equal; to ſubject one to another of them, to whom Chriſt hath given equal power; to reſtrain, yea and take quite away the exerciſe of ruling power in ſome of them, to whom Chriſt hath given it as much as to others; and to enlarge that power in ſome, to whom Chriſt hath given no more than to others. Which I am ſure he will never be able to do: Yea further it's confeſſed by him, that *Chriſt hath inſtituted the Office of Presbyters*; and that he hath *not inſtituted the Office of Prelates, ruling over Presbyters:* Wherefore he muſt either ſay, that the Church hath power to inſtitute new Offices, which I hope he will not aſſert, and I am ſure he cannot prove; or that Prelacy is unlawful. For, that a Prelate is another Officer than a Presbyter, is undeniable, becauſe the one is ruled by the other. Now theſe of the ſame Office cannot be ruled by or ſubordinate to one another; as common ſenſe and reaſon will teach.

§. 2. But to come to the Book it ſelf. My deſign is not a full Refutation, but ſome brief Animadverſions for private ſatisfaction, and mine own eſtabliſhment in theſe truths, that he endeavoureth to ſhake: Neither do I intend to meddle with the whole, but only to cull out theſe paſſages, that relate to *Presbyterian* Government, and any that might infer the unſetling of that or any part of it.

§ 3. The firſt thing, that I meet with, to be diſproved, is *p.* 2. where he aſſerteth a Principle, that will not only ſhake our Faith (if it be received) in the point of Church-Government; but (which I hope he doth not intend) will unſettle us in moſt points of Chriſtian Religion. His Principle is this, *That Difference in Opinion about a point, and probable Arguments brought on both hands by wiſe and able men; if it be not a matter of neceſſity to Salvation, gives men ground to think, that a final deciſion of the matter in Controverſie was never intended as a neceſſary means for the Peace and Unity of the Church of God.* His Opinion in this he ſetteth down in fewer and clearer words in the Contents of *ch.* 1. *things*, ſaith he, *neceſſary for the Churches peace muſt be clearly revealed; the Form of Church Government is not ſo, as appears by the remaining Controverſie about it.* I ſhall firſt ſhew the danger and falſehood of this Principle, and then try the ſtrength of what he ſaith for the eſtabliſhment of it. And 1. I argue thus: This Aſſertion deſtroyeth it ſelf; for if no point, not neceſſary to Salvation, be ſo ſure, that we muſt neceſſarily hold it, in order to peace; then this his Aſſertion falleth under the ſame condition, and needeth not to be maintain'd, for it is not needful to Salvation; I hope, they will go to Heaven, that are not of his mind in this; and I am confident he doth not think it ſo clear, that no wiſe and able men will controvert with him about it; and if it be needleſs in order to the Churches peace, why is it here laid down as the firſt ſtone of the Foundation, on which he buildeth his *Irenicum*? but it fareth here with your Author, as it doth with

with all other Abetters of *Scepticiſm*; they attain at leaſt ſo far their end, as they make men queſtion that Opinion, that they labour to eſtabliſh, by perſwading them to queſtion every thing.

§. 4. Secondly, There is no cauſe at all, why the Author ſhould except from the uncertainty, here aſſerted, things, that are of neceſſity to Salvation; for, if we are to think, that the Lord hath ſo clearly revealed things not needful to Salvation, which are needful to peace in the Church; much rather are we to think ſo of things needful to Salvation (which alſo cannot but be neceſſary to peace; for we can have no peace with them, that deſtroy the Foundation.) For it hath hitherto been a received Principle, that things of neceſſity to Salvation are revealed with more clearneſs, than other things. And, though *Papiſts* have laboured to caſt a Miſt upon Scripture diſcovery in both ſorts of things, that they might take all power to themſelves over the Truths of God, and Conſciences of men, in determining what is truth; (as Dr. *Stillingfleet* would darken the diſcovery of the *circa-fundamentals* of Religion, that he might put the power of determining theſe things in the hand of the Magiſtrate) yet *Proteſtants* have ever firmely maintained, that however the Scripture ſpeaketh darkly in ſome things, not eſſential; yet that the light of it is moſt clear in things neceſſary to Salvation. They are not then of this mans mind, who will have the things, that do not ſo nearly relate to Salvation, but are needful to peace, ſo clearly revealed, that there can remain no Controverſie about them among wiſe and able men, but excepteth from this neceſſity, things of neceſſity to Salvation. From what hath been ſaid, I argue thus againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Principle: If any things not neceſſary to Salvation be ſo neceſſary to be clearly revealed, that we are to look upon them as not Chriſt's Truth, if there remain a Controverſie about them, managed with ſpecious Arguments on both ſides among wiſe and able men, much more things neceſſary to Salvation muſt be thus

clearly revealed; ſo that there is no truth in them, if they be ſo controverted; but the conſequent is moſt falſe and abſurd, and overturneth all the Foundations of our Religion: for have not the *Arrian*, *Soecinian*, *Arminian*, and *Popiſh* Controverſies been managed, yea and are they not managed by the Adverſaries of Truth, with Learning even to admiration. We muſt then, according to this principle, not take either part of theſe debates for truth, but think that the Lord hath determined nothing in them, and we muſt leave it to men to determine in them what they pleaſe, and muſt embrace that. Is not this a fine device to caſt looſe all, to bring in Scepticiſm inſtead of Faith, to make way for a ſubtle Sophiſter to nullifie any truth, by diſputing ſpeciouſly againſt it? Yet this we are to bleſs the Lord for, that the overturners of the Government of Chriſt's houſe, have no other means to caſt it looſe by, but theſe, that do alſo caſt looſe all our Religion: which I hope will be a conſideration to fix this truth the better in the minds of them, who are ſerious and intelligent.

§. 5. Thirdly, If theſe things not neceſſary to ſalvation, that ſpeciouſly on both hands are controverted, be not needful to be determined in our conſciences, in order to the Churches peace, I ask the Author of this Aſſertion, What things of that nature are needful to the Churches peace, that we hold an opinion about them? Or are there any things ſuch? or muſt we heſitate about all the *circa-fundamentals* in Religion, and look on them as indifferences determinable by men, if we will not be guilty of diſturbing the peace of the Church? I hope this good man will not ſay ſo: and yet it would neceſſarily follow out of this principle maintained by him; for I believe he cannot inſtance in many things (ſcarce in any) that are not of neceſſity to ſalvation, which are not controverted, and that with ſpecious pretexts. For learned men, when they erre, uſe not to come off ſo bluntly, as barely to ſay, *it is ſo*, or *I think ſo*; but they bring plauſible Reaſons, and thoſe often pretended

tended to be drawn from Scripture, for their fouleſt errours. If then we receive this principle, we muſt not think it needful to the Churches peace, to determine whether there be two Sacraments or ſeven; whether there be Purgatory; whether we are to pray to Saints departed; whether there be power of Cenſure in Church-men; or if all Church-power be in the Magiſtrate; whether the Pope be the head of the Church; *&c.* for all theſe, and ſuch-like, are controverted; and there are colourable Arguments for the Errours, that men maintain in theſe points. If this, our Author will not aſſert, what reaſon is there, that he ſhould maintain, that the Form of Church-Government is not determined by men for the Churches peace; and that becauſe there are Controverſies about what is the Form appointed by Chriſt.

§. 6. But I come now to examine what the Author hath to ſay for this Aſſertion of his. *We cannot*, ſaith he, *with any ſhew of reaſon imagine, that Chriſt, who hath made it a neceſſary duty for all the Members of the Church endeavour the Peace and Unity of it, ſhould ſuſpend the performance of that duty upon a matter of Opinion, which when many have uſed their utmoſt endeavour to ſatisfie themſelves about, they yet find, that thoſe very grounds, which they are moſt inclinable to build their Judgments upon, are either wholly rejected by others as wiſe and able as themſelves, or elſe, it may be, they erect a far different Fabrick upon the very ſame Foundations.* *Anſ.* 1. The weakneſs, if not wickedneſs of this Argument will eaſily appear, by making an Aſſumption to the Propoſition here ſet down, and conſidering what will neceſſarily follow, which I ſhall thus perform. *That Chriſt is true God*, is a matter of Opinion, which, when we have uſed our utmoſt endeavours to ſatisfie our ſelves about it, we yet find that thoſe very grounds, which we are moſt inclinable to build our Judgments upon, are either 'wholly rejected by others, as wiſe and able as we, or 'elſe that they erect on them a far different Fabrick;

for it's well known that the *Socinians*, who are men of Wisdom and Ability, though it be unsanctifyed; and especially *Grotius* (the wonder of his Age for Learning) though yet he profess the truth in this point: That, I say, they do wholly reject all the grounds, on which we do build our Faith in this point; and that on many of them they endeavour to erect a contrary Fabrick. It doth then follow *vi syllogisticâ* (supposing our Author's Proposition) that we cannot with any shew of reason think that Christ would have us suspend the performance of our duty in endeavouring the peace of the Church on this, *That Christ is true God*; and so we must by this Argument yield this Truth as a *matter determinable by men, rather than hold an Opinion in it with the loss of peace in the Church.* I hope the Author will not own this Conclusion; wherefore he ought not to own that his Assertion, out of which it is clearly deducible.

§. 7. *Ans.* 2. There is very great reason for that, for which he denyeth all shew of reason; for some matters of Opinion of that condition, which he describeth, are the Truths of God, as is clear from what hath been said; but we are to suspend the endeavouring of the Churches peace, rather than part with any Truth of God, or then we should yield it upto men's determinations, as if it were none of his truths.

Ans. 3. When we are to judge of the validity of the grounds, on which we build our opinion about truth, it is not the thoughts of men as wise and able as we, that must determine us; for, we know, the wisest may mistake, when they, who are less wise, may hit the truth through the grace of God: but we must consider whether these grounds be the dictates of the Spirit of God in his word: and if they be, we must not be shaken in mind by the contrary assertions of men, though never so wise, yea and holy too. I grant the opinions of such should make us search carefully; but they must not hinder our assent to the truth of God. And this is a valid reason, why we are to suspend our endevours of peac

on

on ſome matters of opinion, though contradicted by wiſe and able men.

§. 8. He addeth, *That it is not conſiſtent with Chriſts Wiſdom to leave the peace of his Church at the mercy of men's private opinions; which are moſt uncertain; for it is not expected, that all men ſhould be of the ſame mind. Anſ.* 1. It is too great raſhneſs to think that Chriſt cannot be a wiſe Governour of his Church, unleſs he take courſes for its ſetlement, that our Wiſdom thinketh meet. I hope Chriſt may wiſely govern his Church and yet not leave it to Men to determine, what ſhall be the form of it's Government, which yet cannot be, if this reaſon prove that, which it is broughtfor. 2. We may eaſily grant the concluſion of this argument, without giving the leaſt advantage to the aſſertion, which it is brought to prove. It is true, Chriſt hath not left the peace of his Church at the mercy of men's private opinions; *viz.* So as that there can be no peace in the Church, except all men agree in opinion about all things: for peace may be maintained among diſſenting Brethren, by harmony of affection, mutual forbearance, and a prudent managing and concealing of our opinion, ſo far, as it may be without ſin: and all this may be done without denying that, which we differ about, to be determined by Chriſt; and aſſerting it to be a thing left indifferent. And if this be not particable, either through the Nature of the truth, that we diſſent about; in that it is practical, or ſo important that it cannot be concealed; or through the obſtinacy, or wrong zeal of diſſenters; the Lord hath not left his Church without a Remedy even in this caſe, *viz.* they who do unreaſonaly diſſent muſt be cenſured, or ſhunned: and if this cannot be done without breach of peace, it is our Lords Wiſdom to provide, that we ſhould rather looſe Peace then Truth. 3. All that is here ſaid will as well prove, that there is no fixed truth in any controverted point, though of never ſo great concernment: for it may be ſaid alſo in theſe, that Chriſt hath not left the peace of his Church

Church at the mercy of Men's private opinions, which are not the ſame in the moſt fundamental points. But of this enough.

§. 9. From what hath been ſaid, we may ſee what fit advice this healer giveth, while he thus ſaith, p. 3. *The only way left for the Churche's ſetlement and peace, under ſuch variety of apprehenſions, concerning the means and method in order to it, is to pitch upon ſuch a foundation, if poſſible to be found out, whereon the different parties, retaining their private apprehenſions, may yet be agreed to carry on the ſame work in Common, in order to the peace and tranquillity of the Church of God.* Hitherto we conſent with him, and wiſh he would help us to ſuch a Foundation, ſo as it ſelf be founded on the Word of God and not contrary to it. But he goeth on. *Which*, ſaith he, *cannot be by leaving all abſolutely to follow their own ways; for that were to build a* Babel *inſtead of* Salem. This alſo we grant: but that which follows we cannot agree to. *It muſt be then*, ſaith he, *by convincing men, that neither of theſe ways to Peace and Order, which they contend about is neceſſary by way of Divine command (though ſome be as a means to an end) but which particular way or form it muſt be, is wholly left to the prudence of thoſe, in whoſe Power and Truſt it is to ſee the Peace of the Church ſecured on laſting Foundations.* If this be a fit way of healing Church-rents, then thoſe Churches are in the beſt way to peace, who caſt away the Bible, and will not look there what God hath commanded: becauſe ſome may ſay, he hath commanded this, and others, he hath commanded that: and ſo refer all controverſies to be determined by men, as ſuppoſing nothing to be determined by God. And indeed this is the baſis that the peace of the Popiſh Church ſtandeth upon: and I believe no Jeſuit would have given another advice, than this, toward the ſetling of our divided condition. What? Muſt we ſay that neither way is commanded of God, whether it be ſo or not? when we can prove from Scripture that this is Chriſt's Inſtitution, that not, but a device and uſurpation of men;

men; muſt we yield this our ground? and leave the whole matter to men's wills, as being the readieſt way to peace. If this be his cure for Church-Diviſions, I believe they, who take the word of God for their rule, eſpecially in Church-matters, will think it worſe than the Diſeaſe. Every way to peace is not a good way, otherwiſe there were no duty at any time to contend for *the truth, once delivered to the Saints, Jude* 3.

§. 10. I do not diſſent from the learned Author in his Determinations about the Nature of *Right* and *Divine Right*, but muſt examine ſome of the Principles, from which he will have *a Divine Right* to be inferred. Wherefore as to the reſt of the firſt Chapter, I firſt take notice, that what he largely diſcourſeth from *p.* 6. to *p.* 11. concerning the lawfulneſs of that, which is not forbidden by God; however it may be granted *ſano ſenſu* (on which I now inſiſt not;) yet it doth not reach his point, unleſs he prove that Chriſt hath determined *no ſpecies of Government*; for if he hath determined one, then all other inconſiſtent with it are *eo ipſo* prohibited: Wherefore, though we grant to him, that *ratio regiminis eccleſiaſtici* is *juris naturalis*; yet we cannot grant, except he proves it, that the *modus* of it is *juris divini permiſſivi*; that is to ſay, it is *juris humani*; but we aſſert it to be *juris divini, partim naturalis, partim poſitivi, viz.* in reſpect of the divers parts, of which that Form is made up, which are approved of God.

§. 11. To make up an Obligation, whereby we are bound to a thing as duty, we aſſert with him, that there is required *Legiſlation and Promulgation of it.* But what he ſaith of the way of Promulgation of Divine Poſitive Laws, that is neceſſary to lay an Obligation on us, I cannot fully agree to. *P.* 12. *He aſſerteth that whatſoever binds Chriſtians as an univerſal ſtanding Law, muſt be clearly revealed as ſuch, and laid down in Scripture in ſuch evident terms, as all who have their ſenſes exerciſed therein, may diſcern it to have been the will of Chriſt, that it ſhould perpetually oblige all Believers to the Worlds end*;

as

as is clear in the caſe of Baptiſm and the Lords Supper. But becauſe the learned Author could not but ſee, how obvious it was to every one to argue againſt this Aſſertion from the inſtances of the change of the Sabbath, and Infant Baptiſm, which he acknowledgeth to be *Chriſts Will and Law eſtabliſhed*, and yet not *thus revealed*; therefore he laboureth to obviate that Argument by this exception; (to wit) that *there is not the ſame neceſſity for a particular and clear revelation in the alteration of a Law unrepealed in ſome circumſtances of it, as there is for the eſtabliſhing of a new Law: The former* (ſaith he) *may be done by a different practice of perſons infallibly guided; as in the caſe of the change of the Sabbath and Infant Baptiſm; not ſo the latter.* To this I reply a few things. 1. It had been good, if, in an Aſſertion ſo fundamental to his whole diſcourſe, and ſo poſitive for the clearneſs of Divine Laws, he himſelf had uſed more clearneſs; there is no ſmall muddineſs and ambiguity in his expreſſions, which I muſt a little remove. And firſt, when he ſaith, that *Chriſts Laws muſt be revealed clearly as ſuch*; either he meaneth (as *Hooker, Eccleſ. polit.* defending this Opinion of our Author's, expreſſeth it) that they muſt be ſet down in the *Form of Laws.* But it is too great preſumption to preſcribe to him, how he ſhould word the intimations of his will to his People; or in what mode or form he ſhould ſpeak to them: His will manifeſted to us is that which obligeth us; and this may be without ſuch a Form. Or he meaneth, that Chriſts Laws muſt be ſo clearly revealed, as that *we may come to know, that this we are to do, and that to forbear, and that he would have us to take notice of it as his Will*; and this we agree to, and do maintain, that the Form of Church-Government is thus revealed. Another ambiguity is, that he requireth them to be laid down *in ſuch evident terms as all who have their ſenſes exerciſed therein, may diſcern them to be his will to oblige us.* If he mean that they, who have *competent underſtanding and means, and do ſeriouſly ſearch*

the

the truth in theſe things (which, I ſuppoſe, is the meaning of having their ſenſes exerciſed in them) may for the objective evidence of the things come to know them; this we do not deny; if he mean, that *ſuch will certainly be convinced of them, and that there can be no impediment inſuperable by them, neither in the Object, nor in their blindneſs or prejudice, or other Infirmity or Diſadvantage that they lye under, which may make them, that they cannot ſee that to be the will of Chriſt, which is ſo revealed*; this we utterly deny. Now this latter, not the former, muſt be his meaning, becauſe it is nothing to the purpoſe, which I will not impute to ſo learned a man; for what is not ſo revealed, is not revealed at all, ſeeing it is unintelligible by defect of objective light; now, to ſay that Chriſt's Laws muſt be thus revealed, is to ſay that they muſt be promulgated, ſome way or other; which was never queſtioned by any; and maketh nothing for his deſign, *viz. that Chriſts Laws muſt be ſo revealed, as that the diſputes about them ſhall be taken away.* Yea, he cannot mean this, for the change of any Circumſtance of an old Law muſt at leaſt be thus revealed, elſe it is not revealed at all; and yet he requireth another ſort of Revelation of new Laws, as appeareth from what hath been ſaid.

§. 12. 2. If this Aſſertion thus explained were true, there ſhould remain no more Controverſie among ſerious and learned men about any of the Laws of Chriſt; for ſuch have their ſenſes exerciſed in theſe things: Wherefore they may (if we believe this Author) know ſuch to be Chriſts Laws, and therefore cannot be in an Errour about them. But how abſurd this is, ſad Experience maketh too evident: Is it not a Controverſie whether Chriſt hath appointed ſeven or but two Sacramentst? whether he hath commanded us to pray to Saints departed? whether Excommunication be by his Law, *&c.* We muſt then either ſay, that Chriſt hath made no Law in theſe things; or that men cannot miſtake in them; but that they who oppoſe the truth herein,

in, do oppoſe that which they know to be Chriſt's Law, or that Chriſt hath made and revealed a Law about theſe things, but theſe men cannot ſee it, which is contrary to the Author's Aſſertion.

3. Is it not enough to bind the Conſcience of any, who ſoberly ſeek to know what is the good, and perfect, and acceptable will of God, that the Lord in his word hath given ſome intimation, from which we may gather, that ſuch a thing is his will: Sure, ſeeing it is his will, that bindeth the Conſcience, whatever way we come to the knowledge of this will, we are obliged by it to our duty. Now we may be able, in ſome caſes, to deduce from Scripture ſuch a thing to be the will of God, though it be not ſet down in ſuch evident terms as are here mentioned, as is clear to any who do conſider. 4. There are many points of Truth, or many *Credenda*, in the Scripture, which want ſuch an Evidence of Revelation, as is here required; which yet we are to believe as the truths of God; for it is clear, that the Lord hath taught us many things in the Bible, as it were on the bye, and left them to be gathered from Scripture Aſſertions: yea many times Truths are couched in Duties commanded, as Commands alſo are comprehended in Aſſertions and Promiſes. Now if this clearneſs of terms in the Revelation of the *Credenda* of Religion be not neceſſary to bind the Conſcience to believe, how is it imaginable, that it ſhould be neceſſary in the Revelation of the *Agenda*, to bind the Will to act? ſeeing the Lord doth as peremptorily require us to believe what he hath ſaid, as to do what he hath commanded. 5. For the exception that he maketh of the *changing ſome Circumſtances of old Laws*; I ſee not on what Foundation of reaſon, the difference between theſe and new Laws can ſtand; but that this ſhift ſerveth his purpoſe: For (to take his own inſtance) ſuppoſing a ſtanding Law for a Sabbath, and that the *ſeventh day muſt be kept*: This Circumſtance (as he is pleaſ'd to call it) that not the *ſeventh*, but the *firſt day* be

be kept, is really a new law: yea there are here two new laws; one abrogating what was before, and making it no duty to keep the *ſeventh day*: another eſtabliſhing a new, which was not before, and making it a duty *to keep the firſt day*. Now if this may be thought no obliginglaw of Chriſt without that evidence of revelation, which he talks of, why may not another thing, that was not ſuch before? If we are to look to *Apoſtolick practice* as ground ſufficient why we ſhould think it Chriſts will, that *we ſhould keep the firſt day of the week to the Lord*; which was not done before; why ſhould we not think the ſame ground ſufficient, why *Miniſters ſhould rule the Church by a parity of Authority*? Yea, reaſon would ſay, that there is need of more clearneſs, in the revelation of Chriſt's will for altering a ſtanding law in ſuch of it's circumſtances as doth annul one duty, and eſtabliſh another, than for ſetling that as duty which is altogether new, ſeeing in the former, we muſt both know the will of God in abrogating and eſtabliſhing: in the later we are to know only, that he will ſtabliſh ſucha thing.

§. 13. In his examination of what maketh an unalterable Divine right, I agree to moſt that he teacheth; only his *Poſtulatum p.* 14. one which he buildeth all his aſſertions, needeth to be a little cleared. He aſſerteth that *nothing can be founded on Divine Right, nor bind Believers as a poſitive Law, but what may be certainly known to have come from God, with an intention to bind Believers to the Worlds end.* Where I only take notice that, though *Plerophory* in that caſe be very deſirable; yet ſuch certainty is not neceſſary to our obligation: But ſo much knowledge of the will of God as may ſatisfie the Conſcience, by inclining it to the one hand, and not leaving it abſolutely in ſuſpence. If this be not ſufficient, we ſhall take off all obligation of Gods poſitive laws from moſt men: for few have plerophorie in moſt things. I agree with him, that *a divine right is built on the law of nature, and on the immutable poſitive laws*

of

of God: alſo, that theſe are three good marks of the immutability of divine poſitive laws, which he bringeth: viz. *when the reaſon of the law remains: when God hath declared ſuch a law never to be changed: when it conduceth to the being of a Society, that he would have to continue.* Only I cannot ſee how theſe (eſpecially the former two marks) do conſiſt with the *mutability of that Church government,* (in theſe things we controvert about) which the Apoſtles practiſed (no doubt, as being Chriſts will and law) ſeeing there is the ſame reaſon for parity now, that then was: and Chriſt hath not ſaid, that he will have it altered in after ages.

§. 14. Page 23. He comes to examine ſome pretences (as he is pleaſed to call them) for a divine right. And firſt, he laboureth to enervate the argument for the divine right of Church-Government, taken from *Apoſtolical practice:* of which he promiſeth to ſay more after: but what he here ſaith, we ſhall examine. I yield to him, that *all Scripture examples do not bind;* neither doth any example bind as an example: alſo, that the *rule, whereby we know what examples do bind, is not immediately obligatory, but directive.* I grant likewiſe that in ſuch examples, that which bindeth us, is either the *moral nature of the action,* or the *law commanding us to follow the example.* And yet all theſe conceſſions yield him no advantage, neither bring our cauſe any loſs: for when he requireth us, who plead for the divine right of a particular form of Church-Government from Apoſtolical example, to ſhew either the *morality of their actions;* or *a law commanding us to follow them:* I Anſwer, as to the firſt, there needeth no particular demonſtration of the morality of Apoſtolick actions: but this we can ſay for them, the nature and condition of the actions, and the Apoſtles doing of them, being conſidered; reaſon will not ſuffer us to queſtion the morality of them. I mean it is certain that they are the will of Chriſt: for we muſt think that in matters not light and occaſional, but weighty

and

and of great concernment whether they be well or ill done; and which were done on mature deliberation; as the adminiſtration of the affairs of Chriſt's houſe: in matters, I ſay, of this nature, we are to think that the Apoſtles did that which was beſt and moſt approved of God; they being infallibly guided by his ſpirit. Now that, which was beſt to them, muſt certainly be beſt to us alſo, we managing the ſame affairs; except ſome diverſity of our caſe from theirs can be ſhewn: wherefore we are obliged to think that the parity of Miniſters in ruling the Church, is Chriſt's will, and ſo a moral duty; (not a thing indifferent) ſeeing it was ſo in the Apoſtolick Churches; as, I ſuppoſe, is proved by the maintainers of that way: and there is no reaſon why it ſhould be otherwiſe with us than with them. For the ſecond, we have alſo a law for following Apoſtolical example (as we have for following Chriſt's example; which, our Author ſaith, maketh it our duty); *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 4. 16. *Wherefore I beſeech you be ye followers of me.* 1 Cor. 11. 1. *Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Chriſt.* And leſt any think that this command of imitation is only in reference to duties otherways known to be ſuch, as faith, love, &c. it is evident that this laſt place relateth to Church adminiſtrations; for he prefixeth this exhortation to the doctrine of decency and purity in their worſhip. Beſide, that the exhortation being general, can ſuffer no exception; but where imitation would not have the ſame morality in us, that giving example had in them, *viz.* where the caſe is different. Other Scriptures to the ſame purpoſe are *Phil.* 3. 17. *Heb.* 6. 12. and this is commended (which clearly ſuppoſeth a command) 1 *Theſ.* 1. 6. and 2. 14. 2 *Theſ.* 3. 9. *Ja.* 5. 10. Wherefore, if we can ſhew Apoſtolical practice for our way of Church-Government (as I know we can) it is incumbent on our adverſaries to ſhew a reaſon why they did ſuch things, which doth not agree to our caſe; or

elſe to ſubmit to that way, as that which is Chriſt's law. For the other grounds of divine right, that he examineth, we inſiſt not on them, as not being neceſſary to the defence of that truth which we maintain. Wherefore I wave what might be ſaid againſt what he there diſputeth.

CHAP. II.

§. 1. IN the ſecond chapter of the firſt part of his *Irenicum* he layeth ſome hypotheſes for a foundation of his following diſcourſe: where I ſhall paſs over in ſilence, theſe things that have truth in them; and theſe alſo, the examining of which is not needful to the preſent purpoſe, *viz.* defending Presbyterial Government to be *juris divini*. Only, I take notice, that here, and through his whole book, he ſpendeth moſt of his pains and learning, in proving theſe points, which are either digreſſions from the preſent buſineſs, or are not denied by any of his oppoſites: which is *magno conatu nihil agere*.

§. 2. In his fourth hypotheſis, *p.* 38. ſome things need our remark: he ſetteth it down thus: *In things which are determined both by the law of nature and divine poſitive laws, as to the ſubſtance and morality of them, but not determined as to all circumſtances belonging to them, it is in the power of lawful authority in the Church of God to determine them ſo far as they judge them tend to the promoting of the performance of them in due manner.* Two things in this hypotheſis I condemn. 1. That he warranteth men to determine things undetermined in the Church, ſo far as *they judge needful*: he ſhould have ſaid, ſo far *as is needful*: for if we hold this his aſſertion *in terminis*, ſuperſtitious men in lawful authority may bind us in all things where Chriſt hath left us free; ſo that it ſhall not be lawful to ſpeak, look or act in the Church, but

but as they think fit. And indeed here is a foundation for almoſt all the Ceremonies that either Popes or Prelates ever burthened the Church of God with: they are nothing but determinations of what is left undetermined; and they judge them to tend to promote worſhip: as, it is not determined, what Garment a Miniſter ſhall wear, the Church judgeth a Surplice to tend to promote worſhip: then by this hypotheſis, the Church may determine this: which is not only againſt truth, as might eaſily be ſhewed, if that were now my work, but alſo againſt this Author, who declareth himſelf againſt Ceremonies of Mens appointing.

2. That he extendeth this determining power ſo far, that not only things undetermined, and that muſt be determined, otherwiſe the Ordinances cannot be gone about without defect or ſin, may be determined by lawful authority (for this we grant, and therefore do cloſe with his example of appointing the place and hour for worſhip) but alſo things that *they judge tend to promote the due manner of the Ordinances*, may be thus determined; which a little after he expoundeth of the *decency and ſolemnity of worſhip*. This we cannot aſſent to: For there is no pompous Ceremony that ever man deviſed, but they judged it fit to promote the ſolemnity of worſhip. And indeed the Scripture condemning the pompouſneſs and gaudineſs of worſhip, and commending the ſimplicity of it, ſaith plainly, that it is not left to men to add their determinations to God's, to make the worſhip as ſolemn as they judge meet; but that we ought to be content with that ſolemnity, which is made in worſhip by God's Inſtitutions, and the needful determination of circumſtances. Neither can this blow to his hypotheſis be evited, by ſaying, that he ſpeaketh only of circumſtances, which we confeſs may be determined by the Church. For 1. All Ceremonies are alſo circumſtances; and he doth not here mention meer circumſtances, to exclude Ceremonies from the determing power of

Authority in the Church. 2. Though he ſhould be underſtood of meer circumſtances, *viz.* which are ſuch before they be determined; as the habit in which we are to worſhip: yet even ſuch, when they are determined by men without neceſſity, only, that they may add to the worſhip a decency, which is not needful by nature, civil cuſtom, nor divine inſtitution, they become Religious Ceremonies; their end being Religious, and they being peculiar to Religion: As I have ſhewn in another piece.

§. 3. It ſeemeth to me very ſtrange, and not to be paſſed over in our Animadverſions; that in the proſecuting of this his hypotheſis, wherein he had aſcribed a determining power to lawful Authority in the Church; he taketh notice of no power or Authority ſeated in Church-men; but ſpeaketh only of the Magiſtrate: for *p.* 38. ſhewing why there is need to prove this hypotheſis, he tells us of *ſome that give no power, and ſome that give little power to the Magiſtrate about Religion*: and then falleth upon a large debate of the Magiſtrate's power in Church-matters. Which is an evident ſuppoſing, that all Church-power is in the Magiſtrate, and in none elſe: otherwiſe this diſcourſe ſhould be very impertinent to his hypotheſis. But this ſuppoſition is a groſs falſhood, as is fully proved by many worthy men againſt *Eraſtus* and his followers. I ſhall not now ingage in that large debate. If we ſhould grant a determining power to any authority about the things in hand, it ſhould not be to the *Civil Magiſtrate*; but to the Guides of the Church met in a lawful Aſſembly. And it is not only contrary to truth, but a contradiction to what this Author writeth elſewhere, in his Appendix about *Excommunication*; where he taketh much pains to aſſert a power of Diſcipline in the *Church-Guides*: and if ſo, certainly the Magiſtrate is not the lawful Authority in the Church: for that implyeth Church Authority. I hope he will not ſay, that Miniſters have lawful Authority in the

the State; becauſe they have no Civil Authority: why then ſhould we ſay, or ſuppoſe, that the Magiſtrate hath lawful Authority in the Church; except he think that the Magiſtrate hath *Church-Authority*? againſt which he there diſputeth; eſpecially ſeeing *Reſpublica non eſt in Eccleſia, ſed Eccleſia in Republica*; he that hath only Civil power, hath no power in the Church, whatever he hath about Church-matters, and over Church-men.

§. 4. In aſſerting the Magiſtrates power in theſe things, he profeſſeth, that *he will not ſo much make his way through any party, as ſtrive to beget a right underſtanding among them that differ*: how well he keepeth his promiſe may be ſeen, by examining what he ſaith; on which I will not much inſiſt, (intending to meet with this his Doctrine elſewhere) but only mark what is amiſs, with a ſhort ground of our cenſure of it: for this debate is ſomewhat extrinſecal to the *indifferency of Church-Government*: it rather ſuppoſeth it, than aſſerteth or proveth it. In explicating his ſecond diſtinction about the Magiſtrate's power, *p.* 41. *The internal, formal, elicitive power of order*, ſaith he, *lies in the Authoritative exerciſe of the Miniſterial function, in Preaching of the word, and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments; but the external, objective, imperative power of juriſdiction lies in a due care and proviſion for the defence, protection, and propagation of Religion.* The former is only proper to the *Miniſtry*, the later to the *Supream Magiſtracy*. Here ſeveral things are to be noted. 1. That he maketh the power of Order to be all one with internal, formal, elicitive power about Church affairs; and the power of Juriſdiction the ſame with external, objective and imperative power about them. This is inſtead of diſtinguiſhing to confound things moſt different: for, I hope, he is not Ignorant that all the Aſſertors of Church-power againſt the *Eraſtians*, do diſtinguiſh Church-power, or the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (for ſo is this power deſigned by Chriſt) in the power or Key of Order; and the

power or Key of Juriſdiction. Let the Author ſhew us one (not *Eraſtian*) who before himſelf did ever make the power of Order in the Church to comprehend all formal and elicitive Church-power. Yea, he doth by this moſt evidently contradict himſelf (which I wonder to meet with ſo often in ſuch a learned man) for in his Appendix he maketh the power of Diſcipline to be *in the Church*; and ſo to be *formal, internal and elicitive Church-power*: and ſure the power of Diſcipline is the power of *Juriſdiction*, not of *Order*: not only becauſe all that ſpeak of this diſtinction do ſo underſtand it: but alſo our Author doth here make the *power of Order* to reſpect only the word and Sacraments; and ſo the *power of Diſcipline* muſt belong to Juriſdiction, according to him: now whereas he maketh the power of Juriſdiction there to be internal only in the Church: and here to be external in the Magiſtrate only; if this be not a contradiction, let any man judge. 2. Another thing, that here I take notice of, is, that the power which he aſcribeth to the Miniſtry is only *Adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments*. Then they have no power of *Diſcipline*, for every one knoweth that that is ſome other thing than the Word and Sacraments. Now this is contradictory to the whole of his own Appendix: and alſo to Scripture, which giveth to Church-Officers power of *binding and looſing*, *Mat.* 18. 18. *Jo.* 20. 23. and *of ruling the Lord's People*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 13. 17. But I inſiſt not on this, it having been made evident by ſo many againſt the *Eraſtians*. 3. He aſcribed all power about Church affairs to the Magiſtrate, except that of Adminiſtring the Word and Sacraments; and ſo to the Magiſtrate as it is only belonging to him: for he giveth him that which he called the power of Juriſdiction, and that is to him all power but that of Word and Sacraments. Now there was never any *Eraſtian* that gave more to the Magiſtrate than this: for by this means, he hath all the power of deciding

con-

controverſies in Synods (for that is not preaching of the Word) of Ordination, the exerciſe of Diſcipline, &c. and none but he hath any ſhare in it. Behold unto what abſurdities this man runneth unawares, while he maketh it his buſineſs to unhinge that Government which Chriſt hath ſetled in his Church. And indeed I cannot but take notice of a neceſſary connexion between this putting all Church-power in the hands of the Magiſtrate, and denying it to be *juris divini*. For he knew well, that if it had been left to be decided by Church-men among themſelves; it had not been eaſily determined amidſt the intereſt of men claſhing one with another; the more conſcientious and ſelf-denied ſort being ever the feweſt.

§. 5. Page 42. Speaking of the Subordination or Co-ordination of the Magiſtracy and Miniſtry, there be ſome miſtakes worthy of our notice. Though he acknowledgeth the *perſon of the Magiſtrate to be ſubject to the word of God*, yet he denieth it to *be ſubject to the power of the Miniſters*. This is the Doctrine of Court-preachers, who love to flatter rather than ſpeak truth. But conſider. 1 It is to me an inconſiſtency, that Miniſters have power or authority of Preaching the Word; and the Magiſtrate's perſon is ſubject to this Word, and yet he is not ſubject to the power of Miniſters. When they teach, rebuke, exhort with all authority and command in the name of the Lord; doth not this reach Magiſtrates as well as others, if they be ſubject to the word of God? I ſee not how they are ſubject to it, if they be not ſubject to it as declared by Chriſt's Embaſſadors, which is the ordinary way of diſpenſing it: and if ſo, then are they ſubject to the Preaching power of Miniſters at leaſt. 2. Magiſtrates are alſo ſubject to the ruling power of Miniſters: for they rule over Chriſt's Flock; the Members of the Church, of which number, if the Magiſtrate be, I ſee no ground in Scri-

pture for exempting him from the power of their Juriſdiction. When Chriſt ſaid, *Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted, and whoſeſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained*; he did not add, except the ſupream Magiſtrates. May not, I pray, the Paſtors of the Church debar him, if he be a flagitious man, from the Lord's Table, as *Ambroſe* did to *Theodoſius*? and if they may, certainly the Magiſtrate perſonally conſidered is ſubject to the ruling power of Paſtors in ſpiritual things; as they are ſubject to him in civil things. And to deny this, what is it, but to make the ſupream Magiſtrate head of the Church and not a Member of it? Much more worthy to be received is the opinion of *Cryſoſtome*, who ſpeaketh thus to Eccleſiaſtical perſons, in reference to abſtention from the Lord's Supper; *Si dux igitur quiſpiam, ſi Conſul ipſe, ſi, qui diademate ornatur, indigne adeat, cohibe ac coerce; majorem in illo habes authoritatem.*

§. 6. He cometh afterward, *p.* 43. to aſcribe to the Magiſtrate not only a *political power*, which he maketh to lie in the Execution and Adminiſtration of laws for the common good: but alſo an *Architectonical and Nomothetical power* (though not abſolute and independent) whereby he may make laws in things that belong to the Church. His meaning in this he expreſſeth more fully in the end of *p.* 44. *In matters*, ſaith he, *undetermined by the word of God concerning the external policy of the Church of God, the Magiſtrate hath the power of determining things, ſo they be agreeable to the word of God.* And becauſe he knew that the Church-Guides would put in for this Power, that here he giveth to the Magiſtrate, therefore, *p.* 45. he laboureth to reconcile theſe parties, by a diſtinction or two, *viz.* between *declaring Chriſt's Laws, and making new Laws*: and between *adviſing what is fit*, and *determining what ſhall be done.* The declaring and adviſing Power is given by him to the Church; the Authoritative determining power to the Magiſtrate. For *p.* 46. *The*

great

great use, saith he, *of Synods and Assemblies of Pastors of the Church is, to be as the Council of the Church unto the King; as the Parliament is for matters of Civil Government.* And p. 47. but yet, saith he, *When such men thus assembled have gravely and maturally advised and deliberated what is fittest to be done; the force, strength, and obligation of the thing so determined doth depend on the Power and Authority of the Civil Magistrate.* Against this Doctrine (before I come to examine the Reasons that he bringeth for it) I have these things to say. 1. It must be noted (by passing over which in silence our Author hath confounded the matter) that we are not here speaking of things that are properly Civil, though belonging to the Church, *viz.* as it is a Society, and in the Common-Wealth; such as Church-rents, Meeting-places, liberty of the use of them, *&c.* but of the Government of the Church, as it is a Church, of its Discipline; which things are properly the external policy of that Church, as our Author termeth that which he speaketh of. Now the Question is, whether the Power of determining these, be in the Church-Guides or the Magistrate. 2. That which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, and the ground of most of this Author's mistakes, is, he supposeth that some things of this Church-policy are so left undetermined by the word, that they are capable of a determination by men's Legislative power, and that new Laws may be made about them. This is not truth; for, if we speak of the Substantials of Church-Government, even of a particular Form, it is determined in the word, and so not subject to men's Nomothetical Determinations; if of the Circumstances of it, neither are these left for men to make Laws about them, but they are determined by the Lord, in the general Rules that are in the word, and the Dictates of right reason compared with them; and the Obligation, that lyeth on our Consciences in these things, is not from the Magistrates Law (though we do not deny but he may add his Sanction to both sorts of things, and

make

make them the Law of the Nation, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* ſaith well, that he may with any thing in Religion) but from the will of God, which ought to be ſearched out, and held forth Authoritatively by the Guides of the Church, that are acting in the name of Chriſt. 3. It is falſe then that the *Magiſtrate hath Power in determining what of the External Policy of the Church is undetermined in the word.* For if we ſpeak of that which is not determined at all, neither by particular Præcepts, or Examples, or otherwiſe, ſignifying particularly the mind of Chriſt about ſuch a thing, *viz.* by the general rules of the word compared with right reaſon, is not held forth to be the mind of Chriſt; ſuch things ought not to be determined by any man or men, but are left to Chriſtian Liberty; for ſuch things muſt be determined meerly by mans will, but the Lord hath not left the matters of his Church to that crooked rule. But if we ſpeak of things not determined by particular præcepts, *&c.* yet in which the mind of Chriſt is deducible by general rules: Neither here hath the Magiſtrate the determining Power, but they, whom the Lord hath made the Guides and Eyes of his Church; they muſt declare what is the will of Chriſt, not impoſe what is their own Will or Law. And here the Obligation is from the will of Chriſt, not the Authority of the Church, nor the Magiſtrate neither; the declaration of it from them, whom Chriſt hath made his Embaſſadors. For what I have ſaid, I give this brief reaſon, The Affairs of the Church are to be managed by a Miniſterial Power, the fartheſt extent of which is to declare Chriſt's Laws, and apply them; as is generally confeſſed by *Proteſtants* againſt *Papiſts*: but the Magiſtrate's Power is not Miniſterial, but Magiſterial: *Ergo*, it is not his part to manage or determine the Affairs of the Church, of which doubtleſs her external Policy is no ſmall part, which may be further enforced thus; Church-Determinations muſt be the Declarations of the will of Chriſt, but not the Magiſtrate, but the Paſtors are the Embaſſadors of Chriſt, whoſe it is to declare his will: *ergo*, it is not his,

but their part to make ſuch Determinations. We ſpeak not of the Judgment of Diſcretion, which the Magiſtrate hath in theſe things, in order to the adding his Sanction to them; and that not only as others have, theirs being private, and his publick and with Authority: Bnt we ſpeak of that determination of things, which is the ordinary means of promulgating to us the mind of Chriſt in Church-matters. 4. It is moſt falſe that the *great uſe of Synods is to be the King's Church-Council, as the Parliament is his Civil Council*; for, 1. himſelf acknowledgeth another uſe of them, while he aſcribeth to the Church, a power of declaring Chriſt's Laws; is not this of great uſe? but Contradictions are no rarity in this Author. 2. Hence it followeth, that as Parliamentary Acts have no force without the King's Sanction, ſo likewiſe Church-Determinations have none without it; and if the Church Excommunicate any perſon, it is not valid, nor his ſins bound in Heaven, till the King put his Seal to it; for that ſuch a perſon be Excommunicated, is not determined in Scripture. 3. The Council at *Jeruſalem, Act.* 15. and all the Councils before *Conſtantine*'s time, were of no great uſe; for they had not this uſe, there being no Magiſtrate to own them as his Council. 4. This deſtroys that received Axiom among all them, who are not the avowed Followers of *Eraſtus*, *viz.* that the Magiſtrate's power is cumulative to the Church, not privative; for it maketh his to ſwallow it up, there being no Authority, nor great uſe of Synods, without the Magiſtrate. 5. This taketh away from the Church entireneſs of power in her ſelf, in things that do concern her as ſuch a Society, and a Capacity to ſubſiſt without the Magiſtrate; which I hope this Author, when better adviſed, will not own. 5. It is alſo falſe, that when Church-Guides Aſſembled, have deliberated and determined, the force, ſtrength, and obligation of the things ſo determined, doth depend on the Magiſtrate; for it dependeth on the reaſon of them containing the Will of Chriſt, and not on the Authority of men.

§. 7. I

§. 7. I come now to see what Arguments he bringeth for what he hath asserted. 1. Saith he, *Taking the Church as incorporated into the Civil State, though the Object of these things, the matter of them, and persons determining them be ecclesiastical, yet the force and ground of the Obligation of them is wholly Civil.* *Ans.* That the Church is in the Republick we do not deny: yet that must not be so understood as if either these two were not distinct Corporations, or the Power of the one were subordinate to, or swallowed up the other. The saying of *Optat. Milev*: (which he citeth) that *Ecclesia est in Republica, non Respublica in Ecclesia*; will not bear that: but the meaning is, that either the Church is in the *Rep.* as the lesser society in the greater, as a few Parishes are in a County; so the Primitive Churches were in *Rome, Corinth, &c.* or when the Church is *aq; late patens* with the Nation, that the Church is in Protection of the Civil State, not *e contra*; seeing Kings must be Nursing Fathers to her, and as it were keep house for her to be nursed in. Or speaking of a National Church, that it's being a nation is Prior in order of Nature than it's being a Church; because it might be a Nation, and not a Church; but it cannot be a Church and not a Nation. Now, none of these do infer that the Obligation of determinations made by Church men, about Church affairs is civil; but it may be and is Ecclesiastical, *viz.* from the will of Christ, which the Church holdeth forth as his Embassadors. Wherefore this Ratiocination is altogether inconsequent. But he cometh to Authority, to see if that will help him. He citeth *P. Martyr. lo. com. class: sig.* 4. *c.* 5. *s.* 11. and in 1 *Sam.* 8. *Nam quod ad potestatem ecclesiasticam attinet, satis est civilis Magistratus: is enim curare debet ut omnes officium faciant.* What he meaneth for citing both these places for these words, I know not, unless it be that they are to be found in them both. But I am sure neither they, nor any thing like them is in the former place (for the later I have not that part of his works) but the contrary of what this Author intendeth, is there clearly

clearly and fully taught, *viz.* he is refuting them who would have the Power of diſcipline in the Church to ceaſe, now when the Magiſtrate is Chriſtian, and he aſſerteth *Eccleſiaſtical Power and Civil as diſtinct*: and only ſays that the *Magiſtrate ſhould correct miniſters if they do not tarry as they ought*: but this is far from that, *quod ad poteſtatem Eccleſia attinet, ſatis eſt civilis Magiſtratus.* He refers, for the judgment of the reformed Divines in this to *Vedel. de Epiſc. Conſt. Mag. et Offic. Magiſtratus, annexed* to *Grot. de Imper. ſum. pot. circa ſacra.* But it is well known that *Vedelius* was an *Eraſtian* and (as this Author doth) did fowly abuſe the reformed Divines making them ſpeak what they never thought; wherefore I refer to *Apol. Triglandius, Revius*; who have refuted that ſeducing Pamphlet of *Vedelius.* For the other Author, let his Citations be weighed, they will never prove that any of the Reformers gave the Power of determining Church-Affairs to the Magiſtrate. He addeth three reaſons of his Allegation, yet they are but two, for the two former do coincide, and the ſtrength of them is; *that it is from the Authority of the Magiſtrate, that obligation to obedience or penalty is*; or (which is the ſame) it is from him that the *ſanction, or annexing of Penalties to the conſtitutions, is*; that it is from him only that the force of obligation is in matters determined by advice of the Church and which do concern the Church. *Anſ.* All this is eaſily taken away by a well known diſtinction in things that are commanded by Chriſt, and by his Church declared to be ſuch; and alſo, are ratified by the ſanction of the Magiſtrate, there is a twofold Obligation: one *Spiritual*; this is from Chriſt as Law-giver; and is laid on by the Inſtrumental intervention of the Church as his Herald Proclaiming his will: Another *civil*, whereby we are bound to external Puniſhment if we contravene ſuch a conſtitution; this is from the Magiſtrate: of this, not of the former the Author's Aſſertion is to be underſtood; otherwiſe it is falſe: For that Obligation is no way from the Magiſtrate

ſtrate. His third reaſon is, *the Magiſtrate can null an Obligation laid on by the Church repreſentative:* as if they do preſcribe ſome indifferent rites and ceremonies to be obſerved by all; he forbidding them the former ſuppoſed Obligation is null; otherwiſe theſe abſurdities would follow. 1. That there *are two Supream Powers in a Nation at once.* 2. That *a man lyeth under different Obligations to the ſame thing.* 3. *The ſame action may be a duty and a ſin, viz.* Being forbidden by the one Power and commanded by the other. *Anſ.* 1. He ſuppoſeth (which we will never yield to him) that *ceremonies may be indifferent and impoſeable by men.* Nay, all the Ceremonies of God's worſhip, being worſhip themſelves, are Chriſt's inſtitution; otherwiſe but will-worſhip: And ſo himſelf underſtandeth Ceremonies *p.* 68. It is like forgetting what he here ſaid. 2. It concerneth the Author as much as it doth us to anſwer his own Objection, for he aſcribeth to the Church an *intrinſecal power of Diſcipline:* Now ſuppoſe one be excommunicated; the Church commandeth it, the Magiſtrate forbiddeth it; if his prohibition doth not null the former Obligation, the ſame abſurdities follow, that are mentioned in his reaſon; if it doth, then this doth as much deſtroy the power of Diſcipline in that Church, which he aſſerteth; as it deſtroyeth the Power of determining about other Church-matters, which we aſſert. 3. We deny that the Magiſtrate by his power can deſtroy the obligation to any Church-Act (being otherwiſe warrantable) laid on by the Church, or rather by Chriſt, the Church declaring his will (for ſo the Church only commandeth) otherwiſe we might as well ſay (and it muſt needs be this Man's Opinion, if he believe what here he writeth) that when the Church ordaineth a Miniſter and commandeth him to preach Chriſt, the Magiſtrate by forbidding him to ſpeak any more in that name, maketh null the former Obligation. 'Tis true the Magiſtrate may, in ſome caſes, reſtrain the outward exerciſe of what we are ſo obliged to, and alſo when he doth injuriouſly forbid

ſuch

ſuch exerciſe, we may be, in ſome caſes, obliged to cede to this violence: but neither of theſe deſtroyeth our Obligation to our duty; neither the power by which it is laid on; more than the Magiſtrate doth deſtroy my Obligation to obey my Father, or his power over me, when he putteth me in Priſon, and ſo I cannot do what my Father commandeth. The Abſurdities that he would fright us with, do not follow from our opinion, but from his own falſe ſuppoſition. For the firſt, it is *not abſurd that there ſhould be two Supream Powers about things ſo different that one Power cannot have them both for it's formal Object.* Will not the Author grant that Miniſters have the Supream preaching power, that is not ſubordinate to the Magiſtrate: and the Magiſtrate the Supream civil Power? Why not then, that they have the Supream ruling Power in Church affairs? Theſe Powers need not claſh, though the y be not ſubordinate, being about things ſo different as are this world and that which is to come, the Soul and the Body: But this man feareth that *Ceſar* be dethroned, if we confeſs Chriſt to be a King; and ſo would have Chriſt's Kingdome ſubordinate to *Ceſar*'s. For the ſecond, there *cannot be two Obligations* here; for if the Church keep within her Limits, her command is Chriſt's. And ſo any contrary obligation muſt be null: if not, her Authority layeth on no Obligation. For the Third, it is the ſame Argument, and it admitteth of the ſame Anſwer.

§. 8. Having made the Magiſtrate the ſole Judge and determiner in the matters of the Church even Ceremonies themſelves: our Author proceedeth *p.* 49. to examine the extent of his Power, aſſerted in his former Hypotheſis, and here he proceedeth by three ſteps. 1. *That there are ſome things left undetermined by the Word.* This we aſſent to, as it is here ſet down; but cannot underſtand it (as he doth, which appeareth a little after) *of Ceremonies*: but rather of *bare Circumſtances of the worſhip of God* (if he take theſe for one, he is very ignorant of the Nature of both) neither of the *ſpecies of*

Church

Church-Government, for which this indifferency of things is here asserted. What he discourseth here of the Nature of indifferency, I shall not insist upon, intending to meet with it elsewhere. Only I take notice of his concession p 53. that in *things wholly indifferent both in respect of their common nature and their use and end; that are neither commanded nor tend to the peace and order of the Church, there can be no reason why the Nature of these things should be altered by humane Laws: wherefore matters that are indifferent as to a command, but are much conducing to the peace and order of the Church are the proper matter of humane constitutions concerning the Churches Policy.* Let it be here considered that these things are not properly indifferent, but commanded, *viz.* where the peace and order of the Church is injoyned: and if it be so, it is the part of the Church representative, not of the Magistrate, to Judge what things are thus conducible to peace and order; and to hold forth the doing of these, as the Laws of Christ.

§. 9. His second step is, that *matters of this Nature may be determined and restrained; and that it is not to the wronging of Christians liberty, so to do:* And this he doth very largely prove against some as he pretendeth of great note and learning; I wonder who they are: For I never met with any who do deny what he asserteth: It is true that many do, and that warrantably, maintain; that where Christ hath left us free, man hath no Power by his meer will to restrain us; especially in things that belong to the worship of God: but all do acknowledge so far as I know, that in things (though not expresly commanded) which by their nature or circumstances are made conducible to the ends that Christ hath enjoyned us to endeavour, the Church may enjoyn us; and that without making any new Laws; but by declaring the will of God. This and no more do all the arguments, which the Author with much pains hath set down, conclude. And indeed, if our author had once proved the *Species of Church Government to be indifferent*, we should not deny it to be determinable and imposeable (not by the

the Magiſtrate, but) by the Church. In the proſecution of his Arguments, there occur ſeveral things that I cannot aſſent to; but they not being to the Queſtion in hand, and intending to touch ſome of them in a Treatiſe elſe-where, I paſs them here; he hath ſome greedy hints after *obeying whatever is commanded, though unlawful; the non-obligation of the Covenant, &c.* which do diſcover his ſpirit. Though the Author doth ſtate the Queſtion as hath been ſaid, yet all his reaſons whereby, from *p.* 56. he proveth the *determination of indifferent things, not to take away our liberty*, doth prove as much, that *determination grounded on mans meer will doth not take it away*; for in that caſe there may be left a *liberty of judgment*; and there may be *no neceſſity antecedent to the command*; as he ſaith in his firſt Argument; alſo in that caſe, the *determining of the things ſuppoſeth them to be matters of liberty*, which is a ſecond *medium*, and the *obligation in that caſe, is only in reſpect of contempt and ſcandal*, which is his third Argument; and the *repealing of the law or ceaſing of the authority commanding, may free us of impoſitions made by meer will*, which is his fourth Argument. Wherefore theſe Arguments prove that which the Author doth not own, if they prove any thing, which is a token that they prove nothing at all. But that I may ſhortly anſwer them. The firſt Argument is inconcludent; for though *radical liberty*, (*i. e.* a right to do or not do) be conſiſtent with *ſuch commands, as men, without warrant from God, lay on us*, (their authority never being able to deſtroy that right given to us which is founded on the will of God) yet theſe commands are *an unlawful taking away of the exerciſe of our liberty*: for where neither Scripture nor Reaſon (which are Gods law) do bind, mans will ought not to bind; eſpecially in the things of Religion. He hath here, *p.* 57. a gird by the way at them who hold *one poſture of receiving the Lords Supper to be neceſſary*, as more deſtroying liberty, than doth the command of the Magiſtrate impoſing one poſture. *Anſw.* If they hold this without

warrant from the word of the Lord; I yield to what he ſaith; but if they can prove that we ought in this to imitate Chriſt, and keep a table-geſture as he did; it is no deſtroying our liberty, unleſs he think it leſs liberty to be bound to the will of Chriſt, declared by his example, than it is to be bound to the will of men. Other falſhoods I paſs over (it not being my intention to touch every thing) but I wonder at a groſs aſperſion that he layeth on the Apoſtle *Paul*, viz. *that he did uſe the Jewiſh Ceremonies, (as that he circumciſed* Timothy) *when they were not only* mortuæ *but* mortiferæ, and that, where there was no opinion of their neceſſity. What is it I pray to ſay they were *mortiferæ*, but that it was ſin to uſe them? (for when they were *mortuæ*, they were indifferent, not as to the opinion of their neceſſity, but as to their uſe) then *Paul* uſed them when it was ſin to uſe them. I hope the Author will not own this when he is better adviſed: but we ſee whither zeal for an errour will lead men. His other Arguments run on the ſame miſtake, *viz.* they prove that *radical liberty is not taken away whatever be commanded*: but they prove not that when men command without warrant from the Lord, they hinder that exerciſe of liberty that the Lord alloweth us. Wherefore I need not inſiſt on any further Anſwer to them. *p.* 59. He maketh this difference between *laws concerning Eccleſiaſtical and Civil things*; that theſe bind *extra caſum ſcandali & contemptus*, thoſe *not ſo*; whether this doth conſiſt with his opinion that both theſe Laws are from the Magiſtrate, let it be conſidered. I thought that the different way of obligation had been from the different Authorities, not from the things about which the Laws do converſe: and that violation of all the Magiſtrates Laws, had been alike oppoſite to his Authority. I mean, where the things are of equal moment, as certainly may be in things Civil, and Eccleſiaſtical. The wiſe advice of *Ambroſe* to *Auguſtine* (which he citeth *p.* 60, 61.) I do with *Auguſtine* reverence as *cœleſte graculum*: ſo it be

un-

underſtood of Cuſtomes truly indifferent: but that the things we plead about, and that the Author would permit to the will of the Magiſtrate; are ſuch, we cannot yield: Wherefore all this his pains about indifferent things, is to ſmall purpoſe. what he ſaith, *p.* 62. of ſuperſtition in the imagined neceſſity of things really indifferent, I will elſewhere examine; and what others alſo have alledged to that purpoſe.

§. 10. His third ſtep is to ſet bounds to the reſtraint of Chriſtian liberty, where his firſt rule is, that *nothing be impoſed as neceſſary, but what is clearly revealed in the word of God.* But what if it be revealed, ſo as it is viſible to them who read and ſearch attentively; though it be not *clearly revealed*? muſt ſuch things be ſlighted, as no part of Gods will? but of this we have ſaid enough before. The ſecond rule is, that *nothing be determined but what is ſufficiently known to be indifferent in its own nature.* The way to know what is ſuch, he maketh to be, by *taking the primitive Church, and the reformed Churches to be Judges in this.* I confeſs, their deciſion ſhould have much weight; but we dare make none Judge, but God ſpeaking in the Scriptures. What if Chriſt hath in Scripture ſignified his will in a point, and yet theſe Churches looked on it, and uſed it as a thing indifferent? muſt we then think it indifferent? I hope not. This is to lay too much weight on men: eſpecially conſidering that the myſtery of iniquity (which did proſtitute all or moſt of Chriſts Inſtitutions to mens will; as if they had been indifferent things) began early to work in the primitive Church, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 2. and few reformed Churches want their own Lees; from which the Lord is yet daily purging them. Wherefore I think (with ſubmiſſion to better judgments) a ſurer ſtandard, to know what is indifferent, to be this; *what cannot be proved to be determined by the Lord in Scripture, and is not of the Law of nature, neither primarily nor ſecondarily; that is to be thought indifferent.* Paſſing his other rules; in proſecuting the laſt, he openeth a door to *humane ceremoniet,*

monies, (though he ſeem to ſpeak againſt them) by approving the *Feaſt of Dedication*, the *Jewiſh Ceremonies in the Paſſover:* ſure theſe were ſome more than ordinary decency; neither were to be eſteemed of the ſame rank (as he doth) with *building of Synagogues*, *hours of prayer*, which are meer order: the continuation of the Paſſover by *Hezekiah* which was tranſient; no recurrent faſt; and had a reaſon then urgent; and the feaſt of *Purim* which was a Civil ſolemnity: and the faſts of the *4th*, *5th*, and *10th* Months; which were occaſional for the captivity, and expired with it. But of this matter I treat at large elſewhere.

§. 11. In his *5th* Hypotheſis, there is an unwary expreſſion, *viz.* that *things determined, as aforeſaid, by lawful authority in the Church* (which to him is the Magiſtrate) *do bind the conſcience.* I ſuppoſe he meaneth, that we are bound to obey for conſcience ſake; and not that Civil Authority by it ſelf doth reach the Conſcience, which Proteſtants with good reaſon deny againſt the Papiſts.

The reſt of his firſt part needeth not our Animadverſions, ſeeing it containeth nothing contrary to Preſbyterial Government; but rather aſſerteth ſeveral parts of it: wherefore I ſhall only ſet down briefly his Aſſertions, many of which are ſo many Conceſſions to us. He Aſſerteth, (*cap.* 3.) that *the law of Nature dictates that there muſt be a ſociety of men for the worſhip of God*; that is a Church. And (*cap.* 4.) that *there muſt be a government in this ſociety.* Where he maketh 6 things in this Government to be *juris naturalis*; 1. That *there be a diſtinction of perſons, and a ſuperiority both of power and order in ſome over the reſt.* 2. That *the perſons ſo above others have reſpect paid them ſutable to the nature of their imployment.* (cap. 5.) The third thing is, *that all things either pertaining to the immediate worſhip of God, or belonging to the Government of the Church be performed with the greateſt ſolemnity and decency that may be,* (cap. 6.) Fourthly, *that there be a way agreed upon to determine and decide*

all

all the controverſies ariſing in the Church, which immediately tend to the breaking of the peace and unity of it. Where he pleadeth for the definitive ſentence in the *major* part, where power is equal; and for liberty of appeals, where there is ſubordination; as being of natural right: and that this ſubordination muſt be in a Society conſiſting of many Companies or Congregations. (cap. 7.) Fifthly, *that all who are are admitted unto this Society, muſt conſent to be governed by the laws of that Society.* (cap. 8.) Sixthly, *that in a well-ordered Society,* (and ſo in the Church) *every offender againſt the rules of that Society, muſt give an account of his actions to the Governours of that Society; and ſubmit to the cenſures of it, according to the Judgment of the Officers of it.*

All this we accept of as truth, but how this laſt doth conſiſt with his putting all power of juriſdiction in the hand of the Magiſtrate, and leaving the Church-Officers only power of Preaching and Adminiſtring the Sacraments, (of which before) I cannot underſtand. So much for the firſt part of his *Irenicum.*

PART II. CAP. 1, 2.

§. 1. IN his ſecond part we have alſo ſome conceſſions to be taken notice of, as *cap.* 2. *p.* 154. that *there muſt be a Form of Government, as neceſſary, not by Nature only, but by a Divine Law.* This we receive as truth, and do thus improve it *ad hominem*: The Author cannot ſhew us any expreſs Law in Scripture, commanding that there be a Form of Government in the Church: Neither can any Scripture ground of this truth be brought, but what is drawn from Apoſtolick practice; they had a Form of Government, *ergo,* ſo muſt we; ſeeing it is as needful to us as it was to them. Now if this be ſo, why doth the Author diſpute ſo much againſt our reaſoning from Apoſtolick practice (where the caſe is alike) for this particular Form of Govern-

ment, as being eſtabliſhed by Divine Law? If their practice be a ſufficient evidence of a Divine Law (beſide the Law of Nature) for this, *that there be a Form*: why is it not as ſignificant of a Divine Law for this, *that this is the Form*; where the caſe of them and us is alike.

§. 2. We receive alſo as a conceſſion, *p.* 157. *that there is a Divine Warrant for a National Church; and for a National Form of Church-Government.* Alſo, cap. 2. he concedeth *that the Government of the Church ought to be adminiſtred by Officers of Divine Appointment, is of Divine Right.* Where, in one word, he deſtroyeth (unawares) all that he ſaith for maintaining the lawfulneſs of Epiſcopal Government; for he doth not deny that Biſhops as ruling over Presbyters, and having more power than their Brethren, are of Humane Conſtitution; and ſo they cannot be Officers of Divine appointment: If ſo, then by this Conceſſion the Church ought not to be ruled by them; and ſo Epiſcopal Government is unlawful. I know not, if he did foreſee this Argument taken out of himſelf: But in explaining his Conceſſion he would fain ſeem to ſay ſome other thing than he hath indeed ſaid: For he ſaith, that *he here taketh the Church for the Members of the Church: So that his meaning is, there muſt be a ſtanding perpetual Miniſtry*: And this he proveth largely. This doth no ways explain what he hath ſaid: For it is one thing *that it be Divine Appointment that there are Officers*; and another thing *that theſe Officers be ſuch as God hath appointed. Jeroboam* when he made Prieſts of the loweſt of the People, kept Divine Inſtitution ſo far, that he made Prieſts; and did make that work common to all: And yet his Prieſts were not Officers of Divine Appointment: So neither is the Church ruled by Officers of Divine Appointment, though there be Officers who rule, which is Divine Appointment; except theſe Officers be ſuch as God hath inſtituted, and not ſuch as men have deviſed. And beſides this, the Law of Nature dictateth that there ſhould be Rulers in the Church, diſtinct from the Ruled,

as

as he had formerly obſerved: Wherefore he muſt here either trifle, or ſay ſome more, *viz.* that *the Lord muſt appoint theſe ſorts of Officers that ſhould govern his Church:* for the Author is here ſpeaking of what is of Divine poſitive Right; having formerly ſhewed what is of Divine Natural Right.

§. 3. In the third Chap. we have the Queſtion ſtated; in ſpeaking of the Church as comprehending many particular Congregations, (and ſo excluding the Independent way from this Competition) he compareth theſe two forms of Government, *viz.* 1. *The particular Officers of ſeveral Churches, acting in equality of power, called a Colledge of Presbyters.* 2. *A ſuperiour order above the Miniſtry, having the Power of Juriſdiction and Ordination belonging to it.* Now the Queſtion is not whether of theſe cometh neareſt to the primitive pattern: But whether either of them be ſetled by Divine Right; ſo as that the Church is bound to obſeeve it. He holds the Negative: We the affirmative: and we ſay, that the former of theſe two is *Juris Divini.*

§. 4. For proving his opinion, he undertaketh to enervate all the Pleas which are made for the Divine Right of either of theſe: Five he propoſeth, *viz.* 1. *A former Law ſtanding in force under the Goſpel.* 2. *Some plain inſtitution of a new Law under the Goſpel.* 3. *The obligatory Nature of Apoſtolical practice.* 4. *The general ſence of the primitive Church.* 5. *The Judgement of the chief Divines and Churches ſince the Reformation.* Of theſe he diſcourſeth ſeverally: And we ſhall give our ſence of them as in following him we come at them. But firſt I muſt here note a few things. 1. It is an injurious way of ſtateing the Queſtion about this Divine Right, to exclude any who put in for it, from the liberty of Competition: Now he knoweth that others beſides theſe plead a Divine Right of their way; as *Eraſtians* will have the keys given by Chriſt to the Magiſtrate: Independents, to the Community, or at leaſt the Officers of a particular Church (Popery is not excluded,

ſeeing it ſtandeth on the ſame bottom with Epiſcopacy) though I think the Reſolution of the queſtion about Divine Right, might have laid both theſe aſide; yet I think the ſtating of it might have taken them in; and they might have a fair hearing; leſt ſome by ſeeing Presbytery and Epiſcopacy laid aſide as of no Divine ſtamp, might be tempted to take of either of the other two for Chriſts Government, rather than leave the matter wholly at an uncertainty, and the will of men. But I obſerve that though the one of theſe he doth altogether ſlight; yet the other he doth not paſs, out of any miſregard to it; for he laboureth to take all power by Chriſt's gift, out of the hands of Presbyters and Biſhops, that the Magiſtrate might have it *in ſolidum*.

§. 5. 2. I obſerve, for further clearing the ſtate of the Queſtion, that all other parts of theſe two forms of Government, are confeſſed to be *juris divini, vel naturalis, vel poſitivi,* (as from his conceſſions have been manifeſt, and will yet more appear) only the matter of Parity or Superiority of Miniſters is in queſtion: and it being ſo, I propoſe this to be conſidered: that Parity be of Divine Right, it is ſufficient, 1. That Chriſt hath given power to all Miniſters to rule the Church. 2. That he hath not given a greater ſhare of it to ſome than to others. 3. That it is his will that as he hath diſtributed this power equally, ſo that no man make it unequal; ſeeing that cannot be but by taking from the reſt what Chriſt hath given them, and giving to one what he hath not given him. If theſe three be granted, Parity of Power is Chriſts Will, and ſo of Divine Right. Now our Author agreeth to the firſt two as Truth: For the firſt he aſſerteth *in terminis*; the ſecond he cannot deny, while he aſſerteth Superiority not to be *juris divini*; the queſtion then is only about the third, *viz.* When Chriſt hath given equal power to his Miniſters, whether men may make it unequal, by ſubjecting one of them to another; abridging the power of one, and inlarging the power of another: Or which is all one;

whe-

whether it be in the power of men, when Christ hath made but one Officer: to set up another of their own devising, who shall have a power that Christ never gave to any Officer in his Church? I am sure, we have this clear advantage; that Presbyters acting in Parity, do keep themselves within the bounds of Christs Institution; and can shew his warrant for so doing; whereas setting up a Bishop over them is without that line, and can be warranted by no divine Institution. Let it then be considered whether of these is the safest way for us to take.

§. 6. 3. I take notice that the Pleas that he ennumerateth for a particular form of Government, are not all which may be alledged; there may be many significations of the will of God in Scripture, that are neither set down in the plain terms of a Law, nor expressed by Apostolical practice. We draw good consequences from Promises, Reproofs, &c. which may shew us what is our duty. 4. Let it be minded that it is not needful for asserting of Divine Right, that we prove it from all these Topicks: one demonstration that it is the will of God that such a thing be, is sufficient. 5. The question being stated as before, the probation will be incumbent upon him, who asserteth that it is lawful for men to make them unequal in power, whom Christ hath made Pairs: we assert that the power of Ministers that is of Divine Right, is equal; which the Author doth not deny: he asserteth further, that men may restrain this Power in some, and enlarge it in others; for this he must shew warrant; for *affirmant, incumbit probatio*: we deny it; and here we might rest, till it can be shewed that Christ hath given such power to men, to cut and carve on his Institutions. The *Divine Right of Parity* is built on the *want of Divine Right of Imparity*. Notwithstanding we hope, (*ex abundanti*) to make other Pleas for it stand good, which he laboureth to make void.

§. 7. The first plea from a *standing Law in the Jewish Church* we do not insist on, knowing that in matters of Insti-

Inſtitution, the Old Teſtament is no pattern for the New. Neither are we obliged to inſiſt on this Plea, as he alledgeth, becauſe ſome of ours do ſome times make uſe of their Example, as in proving a ſubordination of Courts: For 1. It is not inſtituted, but of the law of Nature; ſuppoſing once the unity of more Congregations: now what is taught by Nature may well be confirmed to us by the Law of God to the *Jews*; though we be not bound by that law, where there is not that reaſon. Again, *Jewiſh* example ſhould have weight with us, where their caſe is not peculiar; ſeeing their practice came from an Infinitely wiſe Lawgiver: but this holdeth not in imparity, or ſubordination of Officers: It is known that the High Prieſt was Typical: that the Prieſthood was annexed to one Tribe, for a peculiar Reaſon: theſe things do not concern us.

CHAP. IV.

HE cometh to the ſecond Plea for a particular form of Government, *viz. Chriſts inſtituting it by a new Law*, where he alledgeth, that *it is more hotly pleaded by many, that Chriſt muſt do it, than that he hath done it.* This is a miſ-repreſentation, to ſay no worſe. If it be not proved by the Aſſertors of Presbyterial Government that Chriſt hath inſtituted that form of Government, let their cauſe fall to the ground. We are ready to acknowledge that it were raſhneſs, and a limiting of the Holy One, to ſay that he muſt inſtitute a particular form: if we were not otherwiſe ſatisfied that he hath done it. But being convinced of that; we may be very much confirmed in our Opinion, by the conſideration of theſe arguments, that hold forth, how fit, and how ſutable to the wiſdom of God, and the Adminiſtration of Chriſts Goſpel Kingdom it is, that he ſhould take this courſe; and not leave the affairs of his Houſe to mans will, or luſt

luſt rather. This is not preſcribing to him; but a declaring of the fitneſs of what he hath done. Moreover, we do not, neither ever did we argue barely from the neceſſity of a particular form to be inſtituted by Chriſt, conſidering the thing it ſelf only: but from ſome Scripture ground holding forth the neceſſity of it. Now if the Lord in the contrivance of the Goſpel hath made it neceſſary to his deſign that there be a form of his appointment, and hath ſignified this to us by his word: it is no raſhneſs to aſſert the neceſſity of it; even though we could not (through our darkneſs) certainly determine what is that form, in all the particulars of it. But I come to examine what he hath ſaid againſt the Reaſons that our Authors do bring for the fitneſs of a particular form of Chriſts inſtituting.

§. 2. The firſt of them is taken from comparing Chriſt the Lawgiver under the New Teſtament, with *Moſes* under the Old Teſtament; and it is thus inſtituted, *Heb.* 3. 2, 5, 6. That as *Moſes* was faithful in that Houſe, as a Servant; much more was Chriſt as a Son; if then *Moſes* was ſo faithful as to declare the Will of God concerning the Government of the Church, and that particularly what Form ſhould be uſed, we muſt not think that Chriſt hath left this undone. To this he anſwereth, 1. *Faithfulneſs is the diſcharge of a Truſt: So that the faithfulneſs of Chriſt and* Moſes *lyeth in doing the Work that the Lord laid on them: and this was to be Mediators, the one Typical the other True.* Moſes *had the Pattern ſhewed him in the Mount, and therefore faithfulneſs required that he ſhould ſettle that Form, and no other: But it cannot be made appear that Chriſt hath any Command from his Father of ſetling one Form of Government.* So he, *p.* 176. To which I reply, 1. Our Argument may be ſo laid, as this Anſwer doth not at all touch it, thus; *It is the Will of God* (and ſo entruſted to the care of Chriſt) *that there ſhould be a Government in the Church*; as is confeſſed by our Author: This Government muſt be managed, *hic & nunc*, in ſome particular Form, as ſenſe and reaſon teacheth:

teacheth: Now that Christ might be faithful as *Moses* was in the discharge of this Trust, it was needful that he should set down a particular Form to be used by all; or appoint some who should determine what the particular Form should be. But according to this mans opinion, he hath done neither of these: Not the first, for that he pleadeth against: Nor the second, for our Author can shew us no Scripture where it is intrusted to any: And if we should require a plain and direct Law for this, in expres and formal terms, as he doth of us in the like case; he would find it a hard task: Besides, if we consult Scripture, there is far more to be said for the power of the Church, than for the power of the Magistrate in such a determination: And reason also may, at least, set them in equal competition, if not cast the Scales in the favour of the Church, it being a matter purely Ecclesiastical, that is contended about; and yet this man giveth the deciding power in this to the Magistrate. It is strange if the Government of the Church under the Old Testament be so plain, and that under the New be left at such uncertainty.

§. 3. 2. That *Moses* and Christ are compared as Mediators, I do not deny: but this maketh nothing for, but against what he intendeth: For their Mediatory Work taketh in the management of all the dealings that are between God and his People; and (as it is here spoken of) is chiefly meant of outward Administrations, of Teaching and Ruling: For the inward Administrations of satisfaction for sin, and communicating the Spirit to Believers, are not applicable to *Moses*: Now the setling the Government of the Church cannot but be a part of this Mediatory work, it being of so much and so near concernment to the spiritual good of believers: Wherefore Christ and *Moses* are here compared in their faithfulnes, in setling of Church-Government as well as in other things. This is clearly confirm'd out of the 5th *v.* of that *chap.* where it is said, that *Moses was faithful in all his house*: Then the Law of Comparison

saith

ſaith that Chriſt is alſo there ſaid to be faithful in all his Houſe, *i. e.* in all the matters of the Church: Now it cannot be denyed, but Church-Government is one, and that a main one, of the matters of the Church. Wherefore Chriſt and *Moſes* are here compared in their faithfulneſs, in this Adminiſtration. 3. His Anſwer doth not well hang together, when firſt he will have them here compared as Mediators, as if the matter of Church-Government were impertinent to that wherein they are compared; and yet ſubjoyneth, that *Moſes his faithfulneſs lay in keeping cloſe to the pattern ſhewed him:* Whereas *Chriſt had no ſuch command laid on him, nor pattern ſhewed him.* If the faithfulneſs of *Moſes* did ly in keeping Gods command, about Church-Government; how is he only ſpoken of as a Typical Mediator? and how is Chriſt's faithfulneſs compared with this faithfulneſs of *Moſes*, ſeeing he received no ſuch command?

§. 4. 'Tis falſe, *that Chriſt received no Command about the Government of the Church:* for the Scripture is clear that he is made *head of the Church; hath the Government laid on his ſhoulders; hath received all power in Heaven and in Earth, &c.* If he be by his Office King of the Church, ſure it is his Office and Truſt to ſettle the Government of his Church. This reply he maketh to himſelf, and anſwereth to it (*p.* 177.) in two or three things: Firſt, he granteth that *Chriſt is King of his Church, and doth govern it outwardly by his Laws, and inwardly by his Spirit; but we muſt not therefore ſay that one Form of Government is neceſſary, whether it be contained in his Laws, or dictated by his Spirit or not.* To this I reply, 1. Neither do we make any ſuch Inference: If we prove not one Form to be contained in his Laws, we ſhall paſs from this Argument. That which we ſay is, that becauſe he is King, and a faithful King, as *Moſes* was, who ſetled a Form of Government, therefore a Form is contained in his Laws: Not that it is neceſſary whether it be contained in his Laws or not. 2. If

Chriſt

Chriſt be King and Governs the Church by his Laws, and that outwardly; how can it be that the particular Form of its Government is what many may think fit, and not of Chriſts Inſtitution? For the Church is governed by a particular Form, not by a general notion of a Government (for *univerſale non exiſtit niſi in ſuis ſingularibus*) if then the particular form be of mans appointing, the Church is not outwardly governed by Chriſts Laws, but by mens; for men make the Laws, or Rule of its Government. If a King ſhould ſend a Deputy to Govern a Nation, and give him leave to chooſe what Form of Government he would, either by himſelf, or by a Council where he ſhould have but equal power with the reſt: it could not be ſaid in proper ſpeech, that that Nation is Governed by the Kings Laws (for he makes not the Laws of its Government) but by the Laws of them who determines the particular Form of Government. Yea, ſuppoſe the King ſhould make ſome Laws about it, as that nothing ſhould be acted contrary to his Will, or Intereſt, that there ſhould be Government, and not Anarchy, that there ſhould be Rulers, and Ruled, &c. Yet the Nation may rather be ſaid to be Governed by the Laws of him who determineth the particular Form: ſeeing the Government doth eſſentially conſiſt in the management of a particular Form, and not in ſome general directions. This is eaſily applicable to our caſe: for our Author will have Chriſt to give ſome General directious about Church-Government; and men to determine and contrive the Form: Now let any judge then, whether the Church in that caſe be Governed by the Laws of Chriſt, or the Laws of men? Wherefore I conclude that this Anſwer deſtroys it ſelf, while it denyeth a *particular Form inſtituted by Chriſt*, and yet will have the *Church outwardly governed by his Laws.*

2. He ſaith, the *main original of miſtakes here, is the confounding of the external and internal government of the Church of Chriſt: and thence, whenſoever men read of Chriſts power, authority and government, they fancy it re-*

fers

fers to the outward government of the Church of God, which is intended of this internal Mediatory power over the hearts and conſciences of men. Reply. We are willing to diſtinguiſh theſe; and I believe he cannot ſhew any of ours who do confound them: yea, we will go further in diſtinguiſhing the outward and inward Government of the Church than he doth: and I may retort this charge on himſelf, hoping to make it appear that he confoundeth theſe two, and that this is the ground of his miſtakes. The Government of the Church is then two-fold: Inward, and Outward: both theſe may be diſtinguiſhed according to divers objects of this Government: for Inward Government is either that which is exerciſed in the conſcience; and ſo is inviſible: or that which is exerciſed in the Church, or in matters that are properly ſpiritual and not civil; though they be viſible to men, and ſo outward in reſpect of the conſcience. So outward Government is either ſuch in reſpect to the conſcience, and it is that we have now deſcribed; or outward in reſpect to the Church, *viz.* That that which is exerciſed in matters relating to the Church, and yet are not properly Spiritual but Civil, and concern the Church, not as it is a Church but as it is a Society. Or we may diſtinguiſh thus, the Government of the Church is either inviſible, *viz.* in the conſcience; or viſible; and this is either in things that are Eccleſiaſtical, and ſo it is inward in reſpect to the Church: or in things that are Civil, and ſo it is outward. The firſt of theſe is immediately exerciſed by Chriſt; the ſecond mediately, and that by the Guides of the Church, as his Deputies; the third by the Magiſtrate as a ſervant of Chriſt in his Kingdom that he hath over all the World. I hope now the outward and inward Government of the Church of Chriſt is ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed, and not ſo confounded as to be the cauſe of miſtakes about it. But now let us ſee whether he himſelf, who chargeth others with this confounding, be not guilty of it; and doth not here miſtake the truth by confounding the Internal

and

and the External Government of the Church. It is very evident that it is so: for, 1. He setteth down the bare terms of a distinction between internal and external Government; but doth not tell what he meaneth by either of them: Whether the distinction be to be applyed to the Conscience, and so be meant of invisible and visible Government: Or to the Church, and so be understood of Ecclesiastical and formal, or of Civil and Objective Government of the Church: We are to seek in this, for all his distinction. 2. He seemeth confusedly to refer to both these, as he here manageth the distinction; or at least, some things seem to draw the one way, and some the other: For when he denyeth Christs power and Authority, spoken of in the Scripture, to refer to the outward Government of the Church, this must be meant of that Government which is Civil, not of visible Ecclesiastical Government. I hope he will not deny that to be a part of Christs Authority. Again, where he granteth Christs internal mediatory power over the Conscience; this must be meant of his invisible Government; both because it is certain Christ hath such a Power, and our Author here denyeth all other power of Government to him: Also because no other power is internal over the Conscience but this. But what-ever be his meaning, this answer doth not take away the force of our argument, for if he deny the Scriptures, that speak of Christs power, Kingdom, and Authority, to be meant of Civil power, but to be meant of visible internal power in the Church; this is all we desire; for if Christ hath such a Kingdom; then the management of the visible Government of the Church is his trust; in which his faithfulness would make him settle a particular form as *Moses* did. Only I take notice how inconsistent this is with his Principles, seeing he denyeth any visible power in the Church (save that of Word and Sacraments, as it followeth immediately) and putteth all other power in the hand of the Magistrate, as do all the rest of the *Erastians*. If he deny the Scri-

Scriptures, that ſpeak of Chriſt's Authority and Kingdom; to be meant of Viſible Eccleſiaſtical Government, and make them ſpeak only of an inviſible Government over the Conſcience; which is exerciſed by his Word and ſpirit; in this firſt he is contrary to all men, for even *Eraſtians* themſelves do grant that Chriſt hath ſuch a Kingdom; but they would have it managed by the Magiſtrate; whom they make Chriſt's Vicegerent in his Mediatory Kingdom: and others do hold ſuch a Kingdom of Chriſt, and that it is managed by the Officers of his Church. Secondly, he derogateth from the Kingdom of Chriſt, denying that which is a conſiderable part of the exerciſe of his Kingly Office: What? is Chriſt a King, not only of Angels, but of Men, united in a viſible Society, the Church; and yet hath no viſible Government exerciſed in his name among them? this is a ridiculous inconſiſtency. Thirdly, he is contrary to many Scriptures which ſpeak of Chriſts Kingdom and Authority; and muſt be underſtood of a viſible Authority exerciſed in a viſible Government; ſuch as *Eph.* 4. 10, 11. Setting up of Paſtors there mentioned is a viſible act: and it is made an act of his Authority, 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. Chriſt's Headſhip is mentioned with a reference to the ordering the viſible decency of his Worſhip. Alſo, *Pſal.* 2. 8. *Pſal.* 22. 27. *Pſal.* 110. 3. *Col.* 1. 13. and many other places; which it is ſtrange daring to reſtrict to the inviſible exerciſe of Chriſts Authority in the ſoul. Fourthly, this is contrary to all theſe Scriptures which ſpeak of the ſeveral outward acts of the exerciſe of Chriſts Government; as *gathering a people to him*, Iſa. 55. 4, 5. Acts 15 14, 15, 16, 17. *giving them laws*, Iſa. 33. 2. Mat. 28. 20. Mat. 5. 17, 19. Verſes, &c. *ſetting up Officers*, Eph. 4. 10. 11. *giving them power of Diſcipline*, Mat. 16. 19. Mat. 18. 17, 18. John 20. 23. Fifthly, it is contrary to himſelf; for Preaching and Adminiſtring Sacraments are viſible acts: if then Chriſt as King hath inveſted

his Servants with this power (which he confesseth p. 177. where also he confesseth that he Governeth the Church outwardly by his Laws) he must have a visible Government as he is King of his Church. That which he addeth, *viz.* that this is made known to us in the word, but not the other; *viz.* that he hath appointed a particular Form: this I say, 1. Beggeth the Question. 2. Destroyeth his Answer, wherein he denyeth Christ's visible Government; for this is a part of it, which he granteth.

§. 5. Another Answer he frameth to our Argument from Christ and *Moses*, p. 177. *That if the comparison of Christ and* Moses *infer an equal exactness of disposing every thing in the Church; then we must be bound to all circumstances as the Jews were: but there is this difference between the Old and New Testament; that there all ceremonies and circumstances were exactly prescribed; here there are only general rules for circumstantial things; there, the very pins of the Tabernacle were commanded; here it is not so, but a liberty is left for times, place, persons, &c.* Reply, 1. We do not plead for an equal exactness in determining all things: We know the Old and New Testament state of the Church requireth a diversity here: but we plead for the equal faithfulness of Christ with *Moses*; now Christ was intrusted with setting up a Government in the Church as well as *Moses*; whence it followeth that he behoved to enjoyn the particular Form of it as *Moses* did: seeing without this, great matters in the Church, even that whereon its Union and Being, as a Society, do hang, are left at a great uncertainty, and exposed to the will of man, who may and readily will erre. 2. The difference that he maketh between the Law and the Gospel is most false, *viz.* That there all circumstances of worship were determined, here not so: yea, it is with more truth observed by some that more circumstances of worship, were left to the pru-

dence

dence of men under the Law, then now under the Gospel: For every one of their actions imposed; as sacrifices, washings, &c. had of necessity abundance of circumstances attending them; as when, how, with what Instruments, &c. Wherefore the more ordinances there were, the more circumstances undetermined. There is indeed this difference; that God under the Law did by his command place Religion in many natural circumstances of worship; as in the day of Circumcision, of killing the Passover, &c. and so set them above the degree of meer circumstances, which he hath not done under the Gospel: but it doth not follow that all things, even of greatest moment to Church-Order, and the worship of God are now left free, because we have not so many Ceremonies as the *Jews* had; for those circumstances, which are of Civil and common concernment to Religion, and other actions, be left to prudence, and matters relating to the Government of the Church, which are of that nature, be also left free: yet we must not for that, think that the Government it self, as managed, even the substance of it (which must lie in a particular Form, seeing a general notion of Government is not practicable) is left to the will of men. I hope our Author will not say that the Form of Government is a circumstance, neither ought he to say that it is a thing of common concernment to the Church and other Societies: The Church is a Society singular, and of another Nature than others, *Cant.* 6.9. *She is but one, the only one of her Mother*, therefore her Government must be sutable; wherefore it ought not to be put in, in the same case with the Natural circumstances that accompany all our actions; which here the Author most unwisely doth.

§. 6. For a third answer he bringeth reasons why *all punctillio*'s (as he is pleased to speak) *should not be now determined as they were under the Law.* In this we do not

contradict him, as appeareth from what is now said: *Quere non respondes ad rem?* Neither is it savoury to account the form of Government, by which the visible being of the Church doth stand, a punctillio: Such a diminutive expression is not without contempt. But let us hear his Reasons: The first, p. 179. is taken from the perfection of the Gospel-state above the Jewish: *That Church needed the fescues of Ceremonies to direct her, and must have every part of her Lesson set her: This must not be still* sub ferula, *and not dare to vary in any Circumstance which doth not concern the thing it self. As boy at School hath his Lesson and the manner of learning it prescribed: At the University, more general directions do serve. In that Church every circumstance was determined; in this things moral remain in force, but circumstantials are left more at liberty.*

Ans. 1. The point in question is not here touched: 'Tis not questioned whether the Gospel-Church should be loaded with Ceremonies as was the *Jewish*; nor whether in every Circumstance she be bound by a Law (though he doth falsly suppose that the *Jewish* Church was bound in every Circumstance, as I have already shewed) but rather whether she be bound in any thing besides the moral Law? And particularly whether she be bound to a form *of Church Government.* Such loose declamations as this, aggravating some absurdities impertinent to the thing in hand, are no solid refutations. I hope the Church may be bound to a particular form of Government, *viz.* to parity of Ministers, and yet have liberty in abundance of circumstances. His example of a *School-boy, and one at the University; of a Son when a Child, and when at Age,* makes nothing against us: For in both Cases they are in subjection to some positive commands of the Master or Father: So is the Gospel-Church under some such Commands, though not so many as the *Jews* were. 2. Is it *contrary to Gospel-perfection* to be under the Commands of Christ as to a Form of Church Government,

ment, and to be ruled by a way of his contriving? This must be a strange kind of perfection that he dreameth of. We believe that the Church is yet so imperfect, and will be while on Earth, that she hath need to be Governed by Christs Laws; and is far happier in that Case, then if she were left to chuse her own way in matters of so great Concernment as is the Form of Church Government. 3. Is it not as contrary, and far more, to the perfection of the Gospel-Church to be under a form of Government, imposed by the Magistrate (as this man would have us) then if it be imposed by Christ? Sure Christs Yoke is easier then mens; and his device must be better then theirs. Indeed in things that concern one Church and not another, it is better that the prudence of Governours doth determine, then that there be an Universal Law binding all: But in things that are equally good to all; it is better to be under Christs General, then mans particular Law. Now the thing in debate, Parity or Imparity among Ministers is attended with the same conveniences, or inconveniences, in all Countries and Conditions, and while men are prone to Tyranny on the one hand and to divisions on the other: Wherefore it is no ways unfit that Christ should here decide the matter by a general Law. 'Tis not like the Time or place of meeting, which must vary in divers places: Neither can he shew us any reason, why it should be one way in one Church, and another way in another, except mans pleasure, which is a bad Rule in the matters of Christ. 4. Whereas he saith that *in the Gospel Church things moral remain in their force; but circumstantials are left at more liberty*: I suppose he meaneth Natural morality, or things contained in the moral Law; and not things that have any morality, or goodness by any Law of God: for if he meant this latter, he doth but trifle; for his meaning must be, that things which are not determined by any command, and have neither good nor evil in

them, are left at liberty; which who doth not know? Neither can he say that it was otherwise in the *Jewish* Church as this his assertion must imply, if that be his meaning. If he mean the former (as certainly he doth) then, 1. it is an ill division of things that belong to the Church, in Morals and Circumstantials: Be there not Christs positive institutions which belong to neither of these kind? The Lord's Supper is no moral thing in this sence; neither, I hope, is it a Circumstantial thing that is left at liberty. 2. If he call all things Circumstantial which are not thus moral; and assert them to be left at liberty; he doth at one blow cut of all the institutions of Christ, and will have the Gospel-Church so perfect as to be under no law of God, but the moral Law, and what Laws men please to add unto it. This I hope he will retract when he considereth what he hath here asserted: For I perceive, that even learned men can say sometimes they know not what.

§. 7. His second reason, *p.* 180. is this, *The Form of government among the* Jews *in the Tribe of* Levy *was agreeable to the form of Government among the other Tribes; and their Ecclesiastical Government was one of their Judicial Laws: Wherefore, if in this we compare Christ with* Moses *we must hold it needful that he prescribe also a form of Civil Government.*

Ans. 1. When we compare Christ with *Moses*, we have very good cause to make an exception where the Scripture hath evidently made it. We compare them then as two Mediators, entrusted with managing the affairs which concern mens Eternal Salvation; among which are Church Administrations: Hence there is Warrant for stretching that comparison made of them in Scripture to their faithfulness in appointing Church Government; but as to Civil Government the Scripture maketh a plain exception, when it evidently holdeth forth

Moses

Moſes a State Law-giver as, well as a Church Law-giver; and it doth as evidently teſtifie that Chriſt was not ſuch; when he denieth his Kingdom to be of this World, *Joh.* 18. 36. And that he is a Judge and divider of inheritance among men, *Luk.* 12. 14. and his mean condition in the World (unlike to *Moſes*) maketh this farther appear.

Wherefore there is no neceſſity of comparing them in Civil, though we compare them in Church-Adminiſtrations. The Lord was pleaſed to make the Government of *Iſrael*, in reſpect of Church and State both, to be *Theocratia*; to give them both kinds of Laws immediately from himſelf: That ſeeing he hath under the Goſpel done otherwiſe, as to State-Government, he hath alſo done otherwiſe as to Church-Government; what a mad kind of conſequence is this? And there is evident reaſon of this differing Diſpenſation under the Law, and under the Goſpel. I ſuppoſe if the difference of caſes that ariſe from variety of Circumſtances did permit; it were the happieſt caſe for God's People to have all their actions and concernments particularly determined by the Lord, who is wiſer then men: now the Lord doth thus with them, ſo far as it hinders not their happineſs, by a load of multiplicity of Laws: Wherefore, ſeeing the Church and State of the Jews were commenſurable, being in one Nation, it was as eaſie for them to have their State-Laws determined by the Lord as their Church-Laws; But it is far otherwiſe under the Goſpel, where the Church is ſpread over ſo many different Nations, of divers diſpoſitions and manners; to have determined all things for the Civil Good of all theſe Nations, which muſt be ſuperadded. To the Determinations of Natures Law, would have made the Bible a burthen to men.

But it is not ſo in Eccleſiaſtical matters, there is nothing peculiar to the Church as a Church, or Religious Society, but (ſuppoſing what Nature Dictates) may without burthening People with many Laws, be determined and impoſed upon all.

Hence is it that the Lord ſaw it for the good of the *Jewiſh* Church, to give them both Civil and Church-Laws, and for the good of the Goſpel Church to give them Church-Laws; but to leave Civil-Laws to prudence guided by the general Rules of Scripture and Nature. Neither do I think (as our Author ſeemeth ſometime to think) that it was *any part of legal bondage to have Laws from God, even in the leaſt matters: and that which is Chriſtian liberty to be free from Gods Laws in theſe things, when we are bound to the ſame by the Laws of men*: I ſhould rather prefer their ſtate to ours, thus far: but their bondage was, to have many things determined and impoſed upon them which were naturally indifferent, and ſo free: which the Lord hath now left free under the Goſpel.

Anſw. 2. It is not to the purpoſe to tell us, that the *Government of the Tribe of* Levy *was like that of the other Tribes*; For Church-Government was very different from Civil Government for all that, *viz.* in this, that it was in the hand of the Tribe of *Levy*, and no other Tribe, which was a poſitive Inſtitution of God: that it did *cognoſce* of other matters than Civil Government did; that it did inflict other cenſures. But let it be never ſo co-incident with Civil Government, yet it was of Gods

Gods Inſtitution, which is all that is needful to our purpoſe. That *the Form of Eccleſiaſtical Government took place among them, as one of their Judicial Laws*, is a groundleſs Aſſertion: Yea, it is a begging of the Queſtion, and alſo taking away the Diſtinction of Church and State among the Jews, which is not needful here to be inſiſted upon, till ſome man Anſwer what Mr. *Gilleſpie* in his *Aarons-rod* hath written to this purpoſe.

§. 8. His third Reaſon, *ib.* is, *the People of the* Jews *were an entire People when their Church-Government was ſetled: the Goſpel Church was but in Forming in Chriſts and the Apoſtles times: they ſettled what was for the preſent need of the Church in her firſt Conſtitution, as in appointing Officers; this will not ſerve when the Church is grown, and ſpread: her coat cut out for her Infancy muſt not be urg'd on her when grown.*

Anſw. 1. This doth no way ſatisfie the comparing of Chriſt's faithfulneſs with *Moſes*; for *Moſes* gave Laws in the Wilderneſs, not only for that wandring condition, but for their ſetled ſtate in the Land of *Canaan*. Muſt we then think that Chriſt took care that the Church in Infancy ſhould have his Laws to be guided by, but afterward to be left to the Dictates of men? Sure our Lord was as careful to foreſee future needs of his People, as to provide for preſent wants.

2. The Church in the Apoſtles days, though not ſo far ſpread as now, yet was ſo multiplyed and ſetled, as that

that she was capable to be ruled by Parity or Primacy. Might there not be a Bishop in *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, &c. and especially in *Galatia*, a National Church? Might there not be a College of Presbyters then as well as now? Wherefore, if the Apostles provided for present need, they behoved either to determine either of these two, *ex ore tuo*.

3. What is there in our case that maketh another kind of Government needful, then what was needful in the Apostles times? We have many Congregations which all need their several Officers, and must be ruled in common; either by all these Officers, or by some set above the rest: was not this their case too? I would fain know where lyeth the difference: may be in this, there could not then be one Head over all the Churches; which now may, seeing the powers of the world profess Christ. It is true, there was a time when Government could not be setled, *viz.* When first a Church was planted, and Believers very few: But I am sure it was otherwise in many places before the Apostles departed this life.

4. Must we say then that the Directions in the Epistles to *Tim.* and *Pet.* and elsewhere, concerning Church-Administration, do not concern us; but their force expired with that time? I must see stronger Arguments than any that this Author hath brought, ere I be perswaded of this: and yet it doth clearly follow, out of what he he saith. Yea, we must say that these Scriptures which tell us what Officers should be in the Church, as, *Eph.* 4. 12. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. do not reach us: but it is lawful for the Magistrate (in this mans opinion) to appoint what Church-Officers he think-

thinketh fit for this time, as the Apoſtles did for their time. For he ſaith, p. 181. the *Apoſtles looked at the preſent ſtate of the Church, in appointing Officers.* This I hope ſober men will not readily yield to: Yea, he is againſt himſelf, as we have ſeen before, and may have occaſion further to ſhew afterward.

§. 9. His fourth and laſt Reaſon is, p. 181. the Jews lived under one civil Government, according to which the Church Government was framed and contempered: but Chriſtians live under different civil Governments; therefore if we compare Chriſt with *Moſes* in this, we muſt ſay that Chriſt did frame the Church Government according to the Civil; and ſo it muſt not be one but divers.

Anſ. It is here boldly ſuppoſed, but not proved that the form of the Jewiſh Church Government, was framed according to the Civil, which we deny, and ſo raze the foundation of this Reaſon. And whereas his aſſertion wants proof; our denial ſhall ſtand on ſurer ground: for the Civil Government among the Jews was often changed: they had Judges, Kings, Governors under their Conquerors: but we read not of changing their Church Government, which behoved to have been, had it been framed according to the Civil. Wherefore neither muſt Chriſtian Church-Government be formed by the Civil, but by Chriſts Inſtitution.

§. 10. To theſe anſwers to our Argument, he addeth, *ex abundanti*, as he ſpeaketh, ſome Arguments to prove the Antitheſis, *viz.* that Chriſt did never intend to inſtitute any one Form of Government. He might have

have ſpared this his ſupererrogation, except he had had more to ſay for taking off the ſtrength of our Argument then we have met with. But to his Arguments the firſt *p.* 181 and 182. he frameth thus; what binds the Church as an Inſtitution of Chriſt, muſt bind as an Univerſal ſtanding Law: one Form of Government cannot ſo bind, *ergo*, *prob. min.* what binds as a Law muſt either be expreſſed as a Law in direct terms; or deduced by neceſſary conſequence, as of an univerſal binding nature: The firſt cannot be produced; The ſecond is not ſufficient; except the conſequence be neceſſary, and alſo the obligation of what is drawn by conſequence be expreſly ſet down in Scripture: for conſequences cannot make Inſtitution, but apply it to particular caſes: becauſe poſitives being indifferent, Divine Inſtitution muſt be directly brought for their binding; ſo that no conſequence can bind us to them, without expreſs declaration that it ſhall ſo bind. This is no new Argument, it is propoſed by him *p.* 12. and anſwered by us *p.* — to what is ſaid there, I ſhall add a little applyed to his Argument, as here framed, his *major* is not ſo evident but that it needeth a diſtinction to clear it. What bindeth as Chriſts Inſtitution muſt bind as an univerſal Law, *i. e.* in all times and places, *negatur*, for there are caſes in which the Lord will admit, and neceſſity will impoſe a diſpenſation with ſome of God's Inſtitutions, as I exemplified before in the caſe of *Hezekiah* keeping the Paſſeover; *i. e.* in all times where God or Nature doth not make a clear exception; or where the preſent caſe doth not exempt it ſelf from the intent of that, as being given in a far different condition, *conceditur*. Hence there were ſome of Chriſts Laws for the Church, temporal; ſome peculiar to ſome caſes: theſe do not bind us, all the reſt do, where they are poſſibly practicable. That the Laws for parity of Offices in the Church are of the latter ſort, we maintain.

For

For his *Miner*, we deny it, and for the disjunctive proof of it we are ready to maintain both the parts which he impugneth. And, First, That there is expreſs Law of Chriſt for parity: which I wonder he ſhould ſo barely deny, that it can be produced; when he knoweth or might know that it is brought by our Writers out of *Mat.* 20. 25, 26. *Lu.* 22. 25, 26. But what he hath to ſay againſt the evidence brought from theſe and other places, we ſhall examine; when we come at them. 2. Though there were no expreſs Law for it, we maintain that there is abundant evidence drawn by conſequence from Scripture to ſhew that this is the Will and Law of Chriſt: as for theſe two conditions that he requireth in ſuch a conſequence; the firſt we own and maintain, that it is inferred by clear conſequence from Scripture that there ought to be a parity among Miniſters, thus; what was the practice of the Apoſtles in framing Church Government, ſhould be ours alſo, except the caſe be different; but the Apoſtles did ſettle the Miniſters in equal power, without a Biſhop over them: neither is there any difference in our caſe that ſhould cauſe us to do otherwiſe; *ergo*, we ought ſo to practice. It is not needful to inſiſt here on the confirmation of this Argument, ſeeing we are here only aſſerting that this concluſion may be proved; not undertaking the proof of it: which is fully done by Presbyterian Writers, and which we are ready to defend againſt what this Author will object. For the ſecond condition, *viz.* that what is drawn by conſequence be expreſly ſet down in Scripture as binding: this is unlike Mr. *Stillingfleet*'s ability to require ſuch a ridiculous condition; for if it be expreſly ſet down in Scripture as binding, then it is not a conſequence but an expreſs Law; and ſo belongs to the former part of his disjunction. And beſides, it is a hard task to put any one upon, to find out a conſequence ſo deduced in Scripture:

What

What if *Anabaptists*, who deny consequences from Scripture in the point of Institution, should put Mr. *Stillingfleet* to prove Infant Baptism by such a consequence as this: where something is said in Scripture, from which the duty of Baptizing Infants doth clearly follow; and where it is expresly said in Scripture, that it doth follow from this, that Infants must be baptized; he would find this an hard task, and yet he requireth the same of us. What he saith for the warranting of this strange Doctrine, wanteth force. It is true Consequences cannot make an Institution, yet they may declare an Institution: we may gather the Will of Christ in matters of Institutions by Scripture consequences as well as in points of Truth. And though Positives be indifferent, it is not needful that Divine Institution be directly declared; for their binding; seeing it is the Will of God revealed that bindeth us, not his Will revealed in such or such terms. He were a bad Servant that would do nothing of his Masters Will, but what he declareth to him directly, and in the Imparative Mood: such Servants to God this Author would have us, that so we may have the greater latitude to be the Servants of Men; taking their Will instead of Divine Institution.

§. 11. His second Argument, *p.* 182. is this; All the standing Laws for Church Government in Scripture may be applyed to several forms, *ergo*, there is no one Form prescribed. For proof of this, he reduceth all the Laws about Church Government to these three heads. 1. Such as set down the qualification of Officers. 2. Such as require a right managing of their Office. 3. Such as lay down Rules for the managing their Office. On these he insisteth distinctly. Before I come to what he

he saith on these three Heads; let me answer generally to the Argument. And first by standing Laws, I suppose he meaneth such as are expresly set down in the form of Laws: and then we deny his consequence, for though these do only respect Government, in its more general consideration, yet that doth not hinder but the species of it may be determined another way, *viz.* by Apostolick practices, or consequences drawn from Scripture. 2. Though we should grant that all the Laws set down in Scripture are equally applicable to either form, yet the one Form, *viz.* Parity may be determined in Scripture thus. Parity and Episcopacy do agree in many things; suppose then they agree in all that is commanded in Scripture; and that Episcopacy be so far warrantable: no wonder that they be not discriminated by these Laws; but then here comes the differences; Parity requireth no more for its establishment, but these Scripture Laws: and so it holdeth it self within the bounds of Divine Institution; but Episcopacy goeth beyond this boundary, by setting up a new Officer in the Church which the Scripture knoweth not; and so one Form is determined, though not by any Law condemning the other expresly; yet by the Laws that warrant it; and the want of any Law to warrant the other. 3. We deny that all the Scripture Laws reducible to these three Heads, do relate to either Form, in that wherein they differ. But let us hear his proofs. He beginneth with the first Head, *p.* 183. where, I confess, that all the qualifications of Persons which he mentioneth may be applied to either Bishop or Presbyter. But then, 1. This is an Argument that Bishop and Presbyter are one, or rather that there is no such distinction by the Will of Christ; for sure there are distinct qualifications required, the one being to Rule, the other to Obey: wherefore if the Apostles had thought there might

might be both Bishops and Presbyters in the Church; surely he would have set down the qualities of a Bishop as he is distinguished from a Presbyter, as well as he setteth down the qualities of a Presbyter. *Confirmatur*, a man may be a well qualified Presbyter acting under a Bishop, and yet not qualified to be a Bishop: wherefore if the Apostle had thought it lawful to set the one over the other, his qualifications of Church Officers are very lame, seeing he doth not shew us who among the Presbyters is fittest to be made my Lord Bishop; as well as he sheweth who among the People are fit to be Presbyters. 2. The Laws concerning qualifications do require in all Presbyters an ability to rule the Church, and do suppose them to be rulers of the Church; as is clear, 1 *Tim.* 3. 4, 5. this is not applicable to Episcopacy, for in Episcopacy it is not needful that Presbyters be able to rule, seeing they have no exercise of that Faculty: as God createth nothing in vain, so he doth not require any qualifications of men in vain. Is it imaginable that if a man be well qualified to Preach, *&c.* and yet unfit to rule; that the Lord will have that man kept out of the Ministry for that want of a ruling ability, seeing he should have no use of that faculty if he had it? *Ergo*, these qualifications are not applicable to Episcopacy, where the Bishop alone ruleth. If it be said, that this maketh the sole Jurisdiction of Bishops unlawful, not their being Rulers together with the Presbyters; *Ans.* If Bishops be set over Presbyters, they must either be only *Præsides*, which is not contrary to Parity (for we speak of Parity or Imparity of Jurisdiction) or they must have Authority above and over their Brethren; and if so they may rule without their Brethren; seeing they may command them and make that power void which Christ hath given his Servants; and so the force of what I have said doth

return

return. Again, if Presbyters under a Bishop have Ruling Power, either they may determine without, or against his consent, or not; if so, the Bishop is but a President; if not, the Presbyters are but Cyphers, seeing the Bishop may do in the Church what he pleaseth.

Sect. 12. He cometh *p.* 184. to the Laws concerning a right managing of their work, which I do not deny to be applicable to either form; and no wonder, for faithfulness is a commanded duty in what ever station God putteth a man: But our Author taketh occasion here to infer the indifferency of either form. 1. Because *Paul* did not determine in his Epistles to *Tim.* and *Tit.* (which chiefly concern Church-Government) whether any should succeed to *Timothy* and *Tit.* in *Ephesus* and *Creet.* *Ans.* It is a bad consequence, for the thing did determine it self, for they were Extraordinary Officers, immediately called by God, being Evangelists; therefore they were to have no Successors, unless the Lord did so call them. Further, they were not fixed in these places, but for a time: they did not live and die there; which shewed that there was no need of Successors to them in that Office. Again he argueth, that the Apostle did not determine how the Pastors of several Churches should order things of common concernment; which, considered with the former, would seem a strange omission, were either of these forms necessary. *Ans.* This is no strange omission, nor should it so be esteemed by this Author, who maketh all that is requisite for the right managing of affairs by the Pastors of several Churches, to be of the Law of Nature, *viz.* that they should meet, that one should moderate, that there should be Appeals, *&c.* as I observed out of him before. 2. We deny that it is omitted: yea, this Author in saying otherwise, contradicteth himself; for he will not deny, but there are directions in these Epistles for Church-Government; and he affirmeth, that they are applicable to either form, *Ergo*, to Pastors acting in Parity; neither was it needful that there

ſhould be directions to them, which are not applicable to Biſhops governing, becauſe the managing of the work is the ſame in both ways, except what Nature maketh neceſſary to a Society, or a ſingle perſon governing, which alſo it doth teach. 3. The matter is determined even in theſe Epiſtles, *viz.* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where it is not obſcurely held forth, that *Tim.* was ordained by a Presbytery; which inferreth, that Presbyters ought ſo to be ordained, and not by a Biſhop alone. 4. Though the matter were not determined in theſe Epiſtles, it is no wonder, they being written to particular men, but it is determined in other Scriptures, *viz.* where Chriſt giveth the Keys, not to one, but to all the Apoſtles then, the only Church Officers; and where *Paul* committeth the care of the Church of *Epheſus*, not to one Biſhop, but to the Elders in common, *Act.* 20. 28. Of this he ſaith, *p.* 184. it is equally a duty, whether we underſtand by Overſeers ſome acting over others, or all joyning in equality. But by his leave, when the Apoſtle giveth this charge peremptorily to all the Elders of *Epheſus* (for to them he ſpeaketh, not to theſe of other Churches of *Aſia*, as he dreameth the Text may be underſtood, upon what ground I know not) there is no doubt left, whether he maketh it the duty of them all in common, or of ſome one ſet over the reſt: And may we not think that this Command is a ſtanding Rule, reaching even to us, as he himſelf ſaith, (*p.* 185.) of what is contained in the Epiſtles to *Tim.* and *Tit.*? and if ſo, then all Paſtors are Biſhops or Overſeers, not one over the reſt by Apoſtolick Authority. He argueth thus, *p.* 185. *Tim.* is charged to commit the things he had heard of *Paul* to faithful men, who might be able alſo to teach others, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. Had it not been as requiſite to have charged him to have committed his power of Government to them, *&c.*? *Anſ.* 1. Yea, he doth here commit power of Preaching, and of governing, joyntly to *Timothy*, to be transferred by him to others; for of both theſe, I ſup-

poſe

pose, *Tim.* had heard from *Paul*: why then must we here understand the one, rather then the other? in that he mentioneth Teaching, not Ruling, it is because Teaching is the main business, and hath the other power necessarily joined with it, by divine Institution. 2. It is not always needful to mention Governing Power, where ever the power of a Minister is mentioned, and here, it cannot be deemed needful, because the Apostle had formerly instructed *Tim.* that he choose none to be Pastors, but they who are able to Rule too, whence it followeth, that when he biddeth him commit to them the Pastoral charge, he intendeth Ruling Power as a part of it; else to what purpose should he require ability to Rule in them? To the same purpose is what he saith of *Tit.* 'That he bid him ordain Elders, but 'told not what Power did belong to them; a Negative 'Argument from one place of Scripture, is inconcludent, such as this is; From the Superiority of *Tim.* and *Tit.* '(I pass his clearing of it, from being an Ar'gument for Episcopacy) he inferreth two things, *p.* 186. '187. First that the Superiority of some Church Officers '(he should have said Presbyters, for of Officers it is not 'Questioned on either hand) over others, is not contrary 'to the Rule of the Gospel. 2. That it is not repugnant 'to the Constitution of the Church in Apostolical times 'for men to have power over more then one particular 'Congregation. These saith he follow, though their Of'fice be supposed extraordinary; and that they acted as 'Evangelists. *Ans.* It will follow indeed from these examples, that Superiority is not contrary to Nature, nor to the Nature of a Gospel Church: Also it will follow, that it is not contrary to Gospel Institution, that the Lord should immediately, when he seeth cause, appoint such Superiority; and what if we say it followeth, that it is not contrary to Gospel Institution, that in some extraordinary cases, that Superiority may be allowed for a time. But none of these are the thing in Question:

for this doth not follow, that becauſe the Lord did immediately call theſe men, and gave them Extroardinary Power over others; therefore he hath not inſtituted, that the ordinary way of Church Government ſhall be by Paſtors acting in Purity, which is here diſputed. His third head of Laws, formerly mentioned, he toucheth, *p.* 188. and bringeth inſtances of ſome General rules for Church Government, which I confeſs are not peculiar to one form: But this doth not hinder that there may be other Rules which are ſuch; which himſelf inſtanceth; as, that complaints be made to the Church: it is an odd expoſition to ſay, *i.e.* Tell the Biſhop. The Church implieth clearly a Plurality. *p.* 187. 'had it been the will of Chriſt, ſaith he, that there 'ſhould be no Superiority of Paſtors, there would have been ſome expreſs and direct prohibition of it. *Anſ.* 1. Might not a prohibition by Conſequence ſerve turn? This is very peremptorily ſpoken. 2. What needeth any prohibition, when Chriſt had inſtituted a way inconſiſtent with it; this was a prohibition of it: now this he did by giving Ruling power to all Presbyters, as hath been already ſhewed.

Sect. 13. He bringeth another Argument of his Oppoſites, *p.* 189. *Viz.* 'That it is of equal neceſſity, that 'Chriſt ſhould Inſtitute a certain Form, as that any other 'Legiſlator that moderates a Commonwealth ſhould do. 'His firſt. *Anſ.* To this is, that Chriſt hath inſtituted 'ſuch an immutable Government in his Church as is ſuf'cient for the ſucceſſion and continuance of it; which 'is all that founders of Republicks looked after, *viz.* 'That there be ſuch an order and diſtinction of Per'ſons, and ſubordination, that a Society may be pre'ſerved among them. Till then it be proved that one 'form is neceſſary for the being of a Church, this Argu'ment can prove nothing. Reply, it is falſe, that Legiſlators looked after no more but that, we find none of them, who ſetled not a particular Form: yea this

was

was neceſſary; for theſe Generals could not be practiſed, but in ſome particular Form, this or that: and of theſe we find they chooſed what they thought fitteſt: even ſo Chriſt not only appointed Generals, but knowing a particular Form is only practicable, he choſe that which he thought fitteſt; mans choiſe in this is alterable, becauſe other men may have as much wiſdom and authority as they; Chriſts choiſe is not ſo, for the contrary reaſons. His ſecond *Anſ. p.* 190. 'Is, what is not abſolutely neceſſary to the being of a Church, is in 'Chriſts liberty, whether he will determine it or not: 'even as when I hear, that *Lycurgus* and others did form 'a Republick; I conclude there muſt be Government: 'But not that they Inſtitute Monarchy, *&c.* this muſt 'be known by taking a view of their Laws. Reply, we acknowledge that Form of Government to be in Chriſts liberty whether he will determine it, or not; but we think it like, that he hath determined it: as for other reaſons, ſo becauſe even men have not appointed the Generals of Government, without a form in which they ſhould ſubſiſt: much leſs would the wiſe God do ſo; if they being wiſer then others, did think it fitter to chooſe the Form then to leave it at other mens will, much more would he. What he ſaith, of inferring, that they did appoint this or that Form, from their modelling a Common Wealth; is not to the purpoſe: for that they did appoint a Form we know by Hiſtory; and, I ſuppoſe, that every one thinketh that they did wiſely in ſo doing; and that their doing ſo was for the good of the Republick: hence we infer that it is like Chriſt did ſo, ſeeing he ſought his peoples good more then they; and the Church is leſs able to chooſe for her ſelf, then thoſe Republicks were; ſeeing Church Matters are of ſpiritual concernment, and ſo lie further out of the Road of mens Wit then the affairs of State do. I yield to him that we could not know, what Form Chriſt hath inſtituted, but by looking into his Laws;

yea, and but that way, we could not certainly know that he hath determined any one form; yet this doth not hinder, but such Arguments as this may have their own weight. The Testimony he bringeth out of Mr. *Hooker*, is answered from what hath been said, and I am to meet with it elsewhere: He mistaketh our intent in such Arguments, and falsly supposeth that the form we plead for is not found in the Bible.

Sect. 14. He bringeth another argument, *p.* 191. from the similitude of a Vine which must have its Dressers, and a House, and a City, which must have Government: it was very easie for him to answer the Argument thus propounded; I know not who ever did so manage it: But it might have been thus improved, a wise Master of a Vineyard will not let his servants do what they please, but will appoint them his work in his Vineyard; and a Master of a Family, or a King in a Country or City, will not let the Servants or Subjects chuse in what they shall be governed; *Ergo*, if the Church be a Vine, a House, a City, and Christ be the Head and Ruler of it, it is not like that he hath left the choise of the way of governing it to men, but hath appointed it himself: If he had thus propounded the Argument, it had not been so easily answered. The same way he useth the next Argument, *p.* 192. taken from the difference of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government; the one of which is called the Ordinance of man, and the other is Gods Ordinance; therefore though that be mutable, this is not. I chuse rather to frame the Argument otherwise, out of his own Concession he maketh difference between these two Governments; the one is for a Political, the other for a Spiritual end; the one for a temporal, the other for an eternal end; the one given to men as men, the other to men as Christians; the one to preserve Civil Right, the other to preserve an Eternal Interest, *&c.* Then, however the Lord let men chuse the way of attain-

taining political and temporal ends, and provide for their own standing as men, and preserve their Civil Rights; yet it is strange to think, that he hath left it to mens choise to take this or that way for attaining their spiritual and eternal end, for procuring their standing as Christians, for preserving their spiritual rights: though the one be the Ordinance of man, sure the other must be the Ordinance of God: But the form of Church-Government is the way to attain these, because Church-Government is the mean, as is confessed, and it cannot be acted but in a particular form, and the form is the way of managing that mean, and so attaining the end; yea, it is such a way as hath exceeding influence upon attaining these ends, seeing a wrong form may more hinder than promote them; man, I suppose, may chuse a way that may do more hurt than good; it is strange then if Christ hath left this which is of such high concernment, to such high ends, to the will of corrupt men: and this Argument may have the more weight *ad hominem*, because this Author is often endeavouring to shape Church-Government according to the Civil, which is very unsuitable to what he asserteth of their differences.

Sect. 15. Another argument *p.*194. is, if the form of Church-Government be not in Scripture determined immutably, then it is in the power of the Church to make new Officers which Christ never made. To this he answereth: 1. These Officers are only said to be new which were never appointed by Christ, and are contrary to the first appointment of Christ, but one set over many Pastors is not such; for besides the general practice from the first Primitive times, Christ himself laid the foundation of such an Office, in appointing Apostles. *Reply.* Here are many things hudled together, to excuse Episcopacy from Novelty, which we must examine severally. 1. They are not a new Office, would he say, because Christ instituted such

an Office, *viz.* Apoſtles. *Reply.* I hope he will not ſay, that the Office of an Apoſtle, and of a *Dioceſan* Biſhop, is the ſame Office; for the Apoſtles had much power, which Biſhops have not, and were Extraordinary Officers, immediately called by God, ſo are not Biſhops: and however there may be ſome reſemblance between them, yet if they be not the ſame Office, it muſt be a new Office from what Chriſt appointed: It is not the want of Similitude, but the want of Identity, with what hath been before, that maketh a thing new; neither need we enter the diſpute with him, what way extraordinary, and what not, in the Apoſtolick Office, nor doth the Queſtion lie in that, as he alledgeth; for we maintain (and I think it will not be deni'd by him) that the Office in *complexo*, *viz.* as it did ſubſiſt in *rerum naturâ*, was extraordinary, and is ceaſed; and therefore whatever Office is made up of ſome part of the power they had, without the reſt of it, muſt be a different Office from that, and ſo new. Indeed if Chriſt had given them their power by halves, and made the one half of it common to ſome Officer appointed by him to continue in the Church, *viz.* power over Presbyters, and the other half of it peculiar to them, then Biſhops having power over Presbyters, though they had been a new Office from the Apoſtles, and not the ſame, yet ſhould they have had the ſame Office with theſe others that we ſuppoſed, and ſo had not been new ſimply; but there being no ſuch thing, they muſt be in another Office than Chriſt ever appointed, and ſo ſimply new. Wherefore it is an unreaſonable demand of the Author, *p.* 195. that we muſt prove power over Presbyters to be extraordinary, before we ſay it muſt ceaſe: For it is enough that the whole Office be extraordinary, that it be not a patern for any other Office that ſhould be the ſame: Yea, we can eaſily prove that that power, as in the Apoſtles, and making up the Complex

of

of their Office, was extraordinary, becauſe it cannot ſurvive the Office it ſelf under that notion; and we can alſo prove, that Chriſt never inſtituted any ſuch power by it ſelf, and without the other parts of the Apoſtolick Office: whence it clearly followeth, that ſuch a power by it ſelf (which is a clear deſcription of the Epiſcopal Office) is divers from all the Offices inſtituted by Chriſt, and ſo is a new Office: What he ſaith of the ceaſing of this power with the Apoſtles, as to its neceſſity, but not as to its lawfulneſs, is moſt impertinent, and a begging of the Queſtion; for the concluſion of the Argument is, that it is unlawful, becauſe it hath no inſtitution, that inſtitution which it had in the Apoſtles being ceaſed. His confirmation of this his diſtinction containeth a manifeſt falſhood, *viz.* to make a thing unlawful, ſaith he, which was before lawful, there muſt be an expreſs prohibition forbidding the uſe of ſuch a thing: This, I ſay, applied to the matter in hand, is moſt falſe, for we ſpeak of things which have their lawfulneſs only from inſtitution, *viz.* Authority given to one over others: now that which is thus lawful, becometh unlawful, meerly by the withdrawing of the Inſtitution, though no expreſs prohibition of it be made. As is evident from the like caſe among men, when a King giveth a Commiſſion to a Judge, it is lawful for him to act in that capacity: now if the King ſhall call in his Commiſſion, though there be no expreſs forbidding of the man, I ſuppoſe it is now become unlawful for him to act. Juſt ſo is our caſe; one Paſtor can have no authority over another, unleſs it be given him by Chriſt, who aſcended up on high, and received theſe gifts for men, *Eph.* 4. Now Chriſt had given once ſuch a power to men, *viz.* the Apoſtles, this he hath now withdrawn; by not giving ſuch Commiſſion to any others, but the Apoſtles; for I ſuppoſe (to follow the former example) that when a Judge which had a Commiſſion

dieth,

dieth, it is a ſufficient withdrawing of his Commiſſion, that the King doth not give it to any other who may ſucceed him: wherefore any who take that power to them, do it without Commiſſion from Chriſt, which is unlawful.

Sect. 16. Another Anſwer he bringeth to this argument, *p.* 195. on which he inſiſteth much, as a foundation tending to eſtabliſh his whole Cauſe, but I hope it ſhall prove a ruinous foundation. The Anſwer is this; 'The extending of any Miniſterial power, is 'not the appointing of any new, but a determining 'the extent of that in *actu ſecundo*, which every Mini'ſter hath in *actu primo*. For clearing this, he under'taketh two things. 1. To ſhew that the power of e'very Miniſter doth primarily and habitually re'ſpect the Church in common, which I do freely 'yield to him. 2. P. 197. That the Officers of 'the Church may in a peculiar manner attribute a 'larger and more extenſive power to ſome particular 'perſons, for the more convenient exerciſe of their 'common power. Before I come to examine what he ſaith to this purpoſe, let me note; 1. That he ſpeaketh here in a new ſtrain, before he had attributed this power of determining to the Magiſtrate, now the Officers of the Church muſt have it, which I confeſs is more fit: But he ſoon repenteth, and in the end of the ſame page maketh it lye between the Paſtors and Magiſtrate, whether he pleaſe. It is ſtrange to ſee how thoſe who looſe hold of the truth, hang as Meteors, and know not where to fix. I take notice; 2. That whereas the former part of his undertaking (which he knew to be out of controverſie among them againſt whom he diſputeth) he eſtabliſheth by five ſtrong Arguments; but for that part where the ſtreſs of the matter lieth, he hath not brought ſo much as one reaſon to evince what he ſaith, but ſome few bare Aſſertions for the clearing of it; and indeed it

is

is sometimes easier to prove the thing that is not, than the thing that is denied, even to such able men as Mr. *Stillingfl.* But let us now attend to what he saith for his Opinion: *We have seen*, saith he, *that their power extendeth to the care of the Churches in common; that the restraint of this power is a matter of order and decency in the Church.* Here are two things, the former of which we have heard, and seen solidly proved; but the latter I have not yet seen, where he hath done any thing but asserted it, as he here doth: but sure, it being a matter of such concernment and controversie, needed some more proof; wherefore I cannot pass it so slightly as he hath done. We may distinguish a twofold restraining (the same holdeth in enlarging) of the exercise of the power of Church-Officers, *viz.* in respect of the Object of it, and in respect of the acts of it. Restraint, in respect of the object of this power, may be subdivided: First, when that power is permitted or appointed to be exercised over more or fewer objects of the same kind, which it doth respect by the appointment of Christ; as that a Minister should have a narrower or larger bounds for his Parish, or more or fewer people to watch over; and so of the limiting of Presbyteries, Synods, &c. This restraint, or enlargement of power in its exercise, we acknowledge to be a matter of order and decency, and may be determined by the prudence of the Church. Secondly, when it is extended to the objects of another kind, or restricted from the whole Species of these objects that Christ hath appointed it for; as when a Bishop by himself, who by Christs Institution hath only power over the people, getteth power, given him by man, over his fellow Pastors; and when a Presbyter, who by Christs Institution hath a power over the Flock to rule them, is hindred from the exercise of this power altogether, and is set only to feed, and this ruling power, as to its exercise, is wholly

rly devolved upon another: This we deny to be a matter of order and decency committed to the Churches prudence. Restraint and enlargement, in respect of acts of power, is when some acts which may be by Christs Institution exercised by all Presbyters, are only permitted to be exercised by some, and not by others; as Ordination, Church-censures: and when some are authorized to do some acts of power that Christs Institution giveth them no Commission unto; this, together with that restraint mentioned in the second member of the subdivision, we prove, not to be matters of order, left to the prudence of the Church, but to be the setting up of a new Office in the Church. 1. Order that the Church is commanded to look after, requireth the right circumstantiating of these acts which Christ hath appointed to be done in his Church; as that they be done in fit time, place, method, &c. neither can this ordering of things reach beyond the determination of circumstances, for whatever is more than this, is not an ordering of that action unto which the circumstances do belong, but an instituting of a new action; because (for example) the right order of reading doth not require prayer, or singing to be joyned with it, but respecteth only the circumstances of reading it self: now, such restraining or enlarging of the exercise of power, is no right circumstantiating of it, but some other thing; it being no circumstance of the exercise of Pastoral power, whether he shall rule or not, but an essential part (I mean as to the integrality, it being an integral part) of that power which Christ hath given him, as is confessed: also, giving the exercise of that power to one which belongeth to many, is not adding of a circumstance, but a supernumerary part of power (as to its exercise) above these parts that Christ hath given them; *ergo*, this is no ordering of the exercise of power, but setting up of it anew. 2. Order that belongeth

longeth to the prudence of the Church, is that unto which confuſion is oppoſite; then is that order obtained, when all confuſion is avoided; but confuſion may be avoided, without this reſtraining and enlarging of Church-power by men, elſe it were in no caſe lawful to let power be exerciſed as it is inſtituted by Chriſt, becauſe we muſt always be careful to avoid confuſion; *ergo*, I confeſs reſtraining of the exerciſe of power, as to objects of the ſame kind, as fixing of Pariſhes, is neceſſary to avoid confuſion: but this cannot be ſaid of taking power of ruling out of the hands of Presbyters, and giving it to Biſhops; elſe we muſt ſay that Epiſcopacy is neceſſary, which deſtroyeth this mans Hypotheſis. If it be ſaid that ſometimes it falleth out that this is neceſſary to avoid confuſion, and then Epiſcopacy is neceſſary. *Anſ.* If we ſhould grant that it is ſometimes uſeful to avoid confuſion, as that which may be the fruit of Parity, yet it cannot be ſaid that Parity it ſelf is confuſion: now, it is not in the Churches power to take her own way, to avoid whatever may have a bad effect (for the beſt things may be ſuch) but ſhe muſt ſhun that which is evil by a right managing, not by laying aſide that which is good: wherefore ſeeing Order is conſiſtent with Parity, and Parity with the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and Imparity goeth at leaſt a ſtep beyond the Inſtitution, and taketh that from men which Chriſt gave them, and giveth it to ſome to whom he gave it not, this cannot be a right ordering of his Inſtitution, but rather ſetting up ſome other thing in the place thereof. 3. The right ordering of the exerciſe of that power which Chriſt hath given to men, muſt conſiſt in determining of theſe things which he hath not determined, and yet are neceſſary to be determined, as time, place, extent of Pariſhes, *&c.* for if men either take upon them to determine in theſe matters, which he hath already determined by his Inſtitution, or to

deter-

determine things that he hath left at liberty, because the determination was not needful to his design, they then, would be wiser then he, and do not order his Institutions, but set up their own. Now this which our Author calleth Ordering is guilty of both these; for Christ by giving Ruling Power to all Presbyters hath declared his Will that they shall all Rule, and especially by requiring an ability for this, as a necessary qualification of them, who should be put unto that Office: do not men then, by appointing who should Rule, pass their determination on what he hath already determined, and that contrary to what he hath appointed. Again, Christ hath not appointed any Superiority and Inferiority among Presbyters; neither is it needful this be, the Church may be without it, and yet men take upon them to appoint it. Is this then to order that Government that Christ hath appointed, and not rather to set up new Officers that men have devised.

Sect. 17. Next he subjoyneth a strange assertion. 'Now, saith he, in matters of common concernment, 'without all question, it is not unlawful, when the 'Church judgeth it most fit for edification, to grant to 'some the executive part of that power, which is origi- 'nally and fundamentally common to them all. *Answ.* If it be so, all this pains that our Author is at, is needless, and his Book to no purpose: For I mistake much, if the main business in it be not to prove the lawfulness of this, which here he asserteth to be unquestionably lawful. For he confesseth that ruling power is given by Christ to all Presbyters: then, we must either say that it is his institution that they all exercise it and so parity is his institution: or, that the executive part of it may be given to some, or may be common to them all; and so the form of Government may be left indifferent is the scope of this Book. Now if it be unquestionable, what needeth all this pains about it.

But

But I conceive, this confident assertion is put instead of the Arguments, whereby this undertaking of his should have been confirmed: It is an easie thing, when one cannot find proofs for their opinion to say, it is out of Question, but it is an unhandsome way of disputing, especially unbeseeming the person, who could not but know that this is denied by his Opposites, and is the main hinge of the Controversie in hand. We do maintain this Antithesis, that it is the Question between us and them who are for the indifferency of Church Government, whether the exercise of Ruling Power may be taken out of the hands of Ministers, and given unto one, to be Bishop over them: and we maintain the Negative as that which should be out of Question: and this we shall not barely assert, as Mr. *Stillingf.* hath done his Opinion. I. Then, this taking the exercise of that power from men, which Christ hath given them is unwarrantable; *ergo*, it is unlawful; I hope, the consequence will not be denied: for what we lawfully do must be some way warranted, either by a Command or a Permission. The Antecedent I prove, because a warrant for such a practice cannot be shewed, and further, if there were any warrant for it, it must either be from Christs command, or 2. From his express Permission, or 3. From the Law of Nature, or 4. From want of a Law forbidding it: But none of these do warrant it, not the First nor Second, for our Opposite cannot produce such Command or Permission, either directly let down or drawn by consequence from it. Not the Third, for then they must produce some dictate of the Law of Nature which giveth leave to do this; but what that shall be I understand not. Nature indeed teacheth, that a Society may use means, for its own Peace and Order: but this may be without hindering the exercise of that power, the Supreme Governour giveth to any of his Officers: there may be this in the Church where Presbyters Rule in Common. Nature

alſo teacheth that when more have a Common power, they may conſult about the beſt way of Managing it; but it doth not teach that they may mannage it otherwiſe then it is committed to them by him who gave it; which they muſt do if they put it into the hands of one, which is given to more: eſpecially, when it may be managed well without ſuch croſſing the Inſtitution of it. Beſides all this, Nature can never warrant this alienation of the Power that Chriſt hath given to his Servants; becauſe Nature doth only warrant us to ſtep beſide Chriſts Inſtitution (in his matters) where Inſtitution is not ſufficient to attain that which is naturally neceſſary; or when the Acting only by Inſtitution would croſs Nature: but there is no natural neceſſity of giving all power to a Biſhop, which Chriſt hath given to Presbyters: neither doth leaving the exerciſe of it in common croſs Nature: *Ergo* Nature doth not warrant this practice. Neither can the fourth warrant it, for then it ſhould be in the power of men to take all the power that Miniſters have from Chriſt out of their hands and give it to one, ſo that only my Lord Biſhop might preach, baptiſe, *&c.* as well as that he only may rule; for their is no Law forbidding the Church, to lay all the parts of Paſtoral power on one, more then forbidding to lay one part of it on one. Sure ſobriety and due reverence to the Inſtitutions of Chriſt would teach us to think, that while he hath given equal power to many it ſhould be a ſufficient forbidding, that any be ſo bold as to lay the exerciſe of that power on one, taking it from the reſt.

Sect. 18. 2. I prove it thus. When Chriſt giveth a power to his Servants to manage the affairs of his Church, it is not only a Licence, whereby they are authorized to do ſuch work, if they think fit, but it is a truſt: they get it as a charge that they muſt give account of, as is evident from the command to this purpoſe given them, *Act.* 20. 28. take heed to the

Flock

Flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you Overſeers: here is a Command to Overſeers to do that work, and they muſt give an account of this their charge, *Heb.* 13. 17. Rulers who muſt be obeyed are ſuch who muſt give an account. Now it is not lawful for one, who getteth ſuch a Truſt, to lay it on another: neither may any take it out of his hands to beſtow it upon another without his leave, who gave that truſt: when Chriſt hath Commanded Miniſters to rule, and will ſeek account of them, may they lay their work on a Biſhop? will it be well taken in the day of Account, to ſay, they committed their Flock to another to keep, who left them to the Wolf, or ſcattered, and ſlew them: will not the Lord ſay to them why did not ye feed them your ſelves? Sure Chriſt will require account of them to whom he gave the charge, and that is of Paſtors, neither will he ask Account of Biſhops, except for their Uſurpation. *Ergo* it is not lawful, to take the exerciſe of Church Power out of the hands of Miniſters, and give it to a Biſhop. 3. Proof. If Presbyters, who have received Power from Chriſt may put the exerciſe of it into the hands of a Biſhop alienating it from themſelves; why may not Biſhops devolve their Power on one who ſhall be over them, and ſo we ſhall have an Univerſal Biſhop the Pope; in whom ſhall reſt all Church Power, and at whoſe direction it ſhall be exerciſed? If that may be done, there is no ſhadow of Reaſon why this may not be done, for if once the Power be taken out of the hand of them to whom Chriſt hath given it, then prudence muſt be the only Director to teach us who muſt have it: now prudence will as well ſay, that Biſhops muſt have one over them to keep them in Order and peace, as that Presbyters muſt have one over them. Neither is there here any inconvenience that is not there; for that one may turn to tyranny as well as the other: and a Biſhop cannot overſee his charge, without ſubſtitutes, more then the Pope

can do: the one may ſubſtitute Biſhops, Cardinals, *&c.* as well as the other may ſubſtitute Dean, Prebends, Archdeacon, *&c.* Now, I hope, Mr. *Stillingfleet* is not come to that, to think the Papal Office an indifferent Ceremony. *ergo.* neither ſhould he think ſo of Epiſcopacy. 4. If Presbyters may devolve the exerciſe of that power that Chriſt hath given them into the hands of a Biſhop, then they may alſo give away with their power the very Office that Chriſt hath given them: But this they may not. *ergo* I prove the Major, for when they devolve the exerciſe of their ruling power on the Biſhop, they not only conſent, that they ſhall rule the people, which they might do: But they make it unlawful for themſelves to rule, yea, they give up themſelves to be ruled and commanded by them, ſo that he is their Judge and cannot be judged by them, in caſe of male-adminiſtration (at leaſt this is true *de ſingulis* if not *de omnibus*) but this is to give away the very power; for if I may not act, how have I a power to act; if both I and the people be under the command of another, ſo that I may not act any thing in reference to the People but by his authority, how have I power to rule? ſure a power is the poſſibility of the act (*quantum eſt ex parte cauſæ*) and a moral power is ſuch a lawfulneſs of the act, but in this caſe Presbyters want that poſſibility, or lawfulneſs of that exerciſe of Ruling; and that ſo, as the defect or hindrance *ex parte cauſæ*, is in themſelves, who ſhould put forth the acts, *ergo*, they want not onely the exerciſe but the very power of Ruling, which Chriſt gave them, in ſuch a caſe. The Minor of the Argument is evident; for ſuch an alienation were a clear contradicting of Chriſt: he ſaith it ſhall be lawful for you (ſuch a one being lawfully put into the Miniſtry) to rule: he by this alienating ſaith, it ſhall not be lawful for me to rule. If it be ſaid, that Chriſts gift maketh it lawful for ſuch a

one

one to rule, but not in all caſes; as ſuppoſe the good of the Church requires that this power be taken from him; his alienating maketh it onely unlawfull in this caſe, when for the good of the Church, he hath quit his right: ſo that here there is no oppoſition; Chriſt giveth him a *jus in actu primo*, he alienateth onely this *jus in actu ſecundo*, as Mr. *Stillingfleet* doth expreſs it. *Anſw.* 1. However there may be ſome colour of reaſon why this may be done in ſome extraordinary caſes; when Chriſts inſtitution (which is calculated to ordinary caſes, and muſt ordinarily take place) cannot reach the end of Government: yet to ſay that it may be done ordinarily, cannot but claſh with Chriſts inſtitution: for when Chriſt giveth ruling power to Presbyters, though we may think that it is not his will, that they muſt needs exerciſe it in all caſes, yet muſt we think that he intendeth they ſhould exerciſe it ordinarily: for why giveth he them a power, which they as readily never as ever act, and that as men pleaſe to determine? we muſt not think that it is the intent of Chriſts Commiſſion to his Servants, that men may without the force of neceſſity laid on by an extraordinary Providence (and then God doth it and not men) hinder the acts of it as as they will. 2. It is ſuppoſed without ground that the good of the Church can ordinarily require the reſtraining power given by Chriſt; for if we ſpeak of what is ordinarily good for the Church, how can we better diſcern that than by looking into Chriſts inſtitution? wherefore, ſeeing by this equal power, at leaſt *in actu primo* is given to Presbytery; we are to think, that the exerciſe of this power is beſt for the Church; though ambitious men, and they who would flatter the Magiſtrate, think otherwiſe; yea though the beſt of men ſhould diſſent, ſure Chriſts giving ſuch a power ſaith more for the goodneſs of the exerciſe of it then mens opinions, though ſeeming to have a foun-

dation on ſome inconveniencies of it can ſay againſt it: eſpecially conſidering, what ever way beſide, men deviſe, is attended with as great, if not greater inconveniencies of another nature. 3. I have already made it appear, that this alienation of power given by Chriſt doth not only reach the *actus ſecundus* of it, but even the *actus primus*; ſeeing a man is not in capacity to recal his deed, and reaſſume the exerciſe of his power, though it were improved never ſo much againſt the end of Chriſts giving, and his alienating of it.

Sect. 19. 5. Proof (which is directly againſt enlarging the exerciſe of Church Power in the hands of any beyond what Chriſt hath given them) if the exerciſe of that power, which Chriſt hath given to all, may be taken from the reſt and given to one, then that one getteth a power both *in actu primo & in ſecundo*, which he had not from Chriſt, but this is unlawful, *ergo* The Major I prove: for it is clear he getteth power *in actu ſecundo*, which he had not from Chriſt, *ergo* he getteth ſuch power in *actu primo*, ſeeing *actus ſecundus* cannot be without *primus*, nor lawful exerciſe of power without the *jus* or power it ſelf. If it be ſaid, that Chriſt giveth only the *actus primus*, and that ſo as it extendeth to the whole Church: and therefore no *actus ſecundus* of power can be given to one, which doth extend further than this. *Anſw.* 1. It is true, he giveth formally only the *actus primus*, but the *actus ſecundus* doth reſult from it, and therefore he giveth both. 2. It is true, the power that Chriſt giveth doth extend to the whole Church, but this muſt be underſtood with a twofold diſtinction. *Diſt.* 1. Disjunctive it is true, that is, every Miniſter hath a power to rule whatever part of the Church, this or that, or another; ſo that no part of it is without his Commiſſion, as that he ſhould go beyond his bounds in being ſet over it. Conjunctive, it is falſe, that is, Chriſt hath not given ſo much of the *actus primus* of

power

power to rule all, or many Congregations. *Dist.* 2. When Christ giveth the *actus primus* of power to a Minister, extending to the whole Church; it is to be understood in adequate, *i. e.* that he hath a share in that power so extended; and may in conjunction with other rule the whole Church: not adequate, *i. e.* Christ hath not given to any such a power, as that he by himself or with a few excluding the rest, who are also in the Commission, rule the whole Church. So that when ever any one exerciseth authority by himself, or excluding others, who have the same power granted by Christ, over more than his particular Congregation, over which he may have personal inspection; he taketh a power in *actu secundo*, where Christ hath given him no *jus*, nor *actus primus* of power. The Minor of the argument is manifest; for when both power and exercise of it is given to a man, which Christ hath not given; this is setting up a new Office, which Christ hath not set up: for what is an Office in the Church, but a power and a lawful exercise of it? but this our Author confesseth to be unlawful, *ergo* 6. Proof. 'Tis presumption even among men for a servant to commit that work to another to do, which his Master hath given him to do, except he know, that he hath his Masters leave so to do: this is so well known, that I need not insist on it, *ergo* it is much presumption, when Christ hath committed the ruling of his house to every Minister, that some should devolve that work on a Bishop to do it for them, unless they could shew Christs warrant for this, which if Mr. *Stillingfleet* or any other will do, we shall acquiesce. If there be any disparity in this comparison, I am sure it will tend to the strengthening, not the weakening of our argument, for we are more absolutely under Christs command, than Servants are under their Masters; his commands are more perfect and effectual to compass their end, without our taking our own way in managing

naging obedience to them, then mens are: alſo, the there is a greater tie to cleave ſcrupulouſly to his injunctions than to mens: alſo the matters about which they are, be of more weight, and miſcarriage in them more dangerous, then mens commands. All which make it more abſurd to commit the exerciſe of our power, that he giveth to others, than for Servants to do ſo with their Maſters work.

Sect. 20. For better underſtanding of what he had ſaid, our Author ſubjoyneth a diſtinction of a twofold power belonging to Church Officers, *viz.* a Power of Order in preaching the word, viſiting the ſick, adminiſtring the Sacraments, *&c.* this he maketh to be inſeparably joyned to the function; and to belong to every ones perſonal capacity, both in *actu primo*, and *actu ſecundo*, and a power of Juriſdiction, in viſiting Churches, overſeeing particular Paſtors, Ordination, Church Cenſures, making Rules for decency: this he maketh to be in every Presbyter *quoad aptitudinem* and habitually, ſo as he hath a *jus* to it in *actu primo*; but the exerciſe and limitation of it, and ſome further power of choiſe and delegation to it, and ſome further Authority beſides the power of Order. And when this power, either by conſent of the Paſtors of the Church, or by the appointment of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, or both, is devolved to ſome particular perſons; though *quoad aptitudinem*, the power remain in every Presbyter; yet *quoad executionem*, it belongs to them who are ſo appointed. To this, I reprove a few things briefly. 1. I take notice here of a contradiction in *terminis*, to what he taught, *Part.* 1. *c.* 2. *p.* 41. and we refuted *p.* there he made the power of Order peculiar to Miniſters and power of Juriſdiction peculiar to the Magiſtrate, deſcribing both powers no otherwiſe then he doth here, and yet here he giveth the power of Juriſdiction as well as of Order to Miniſters. 2. Seeing he acknowledgeth both powers

quoad

quoad jus to be equally given by Christ to all Ministers; it is strange that he should deny that men may restrain the one (for he confesseth the *actus secundus* of it to be inseparably joined to the Office) and yet doth boldly affirm that they may restrain the other; without giving the least shew of permission that they have from Christ who gave both powers, so to tamper with the one more then with the other. If Christ hath made no difference between these (and if he hath it should have been produced) how dare men do it? I confess, Nature maketh a necessity of restricting the power of Jurisdiction: for if every one should Rule, when and where he pleased, there would be confusion; and therefore it is needful that every one have their own charge which they exercise this power over: but this is common to the power of Order also (though with some difference) for it is not fit that every Minister should preach and baptize where and when he pleaseth, without any limitation. Neither could this be without confusion. Also Christ hath made a limitation of the exercise of the power of Jurisdiction; for by giving it to many, and making it relate to things of common concernment, he hath, *eo ipso*, determined, that none of these who have it, shall exercise it by himself nor without the concurrence and consent of them, who are equal in Commission with him. This limitation of the exercise we confess to be warrantable: but what reason there is, I cannot understand, why men should take away the exercise of ruling power from many, and give it to one, more than they can take away the exercise of preaching power, and so give it to some, as it shall not be lawful for them to preach, but only to rule, more than they can take away the exercise of both powers, seeing Christ hath equally given them. Sure it is an impregnable Argument that our Author here furnisheth us with against himself; men

may not reſtrain the exerciſe of the power of order, further than Nature maketh it neceſſary; *Ergo*, they may not any further reſtrain the exerciſe of the power of Juriſdiction, becauſe Chriſt hath not made ſuch a difference in his giving theſe powers to men. If it be ſaid, that the reſtraint of the power of Juriſdiction is ſometimes neceſſary, becauſe Parity breeds Factions, and many are unfit to rule. *Anſ.* Even ſo, letting all preach, doth often breed Hereſie, many preach falſe Doctrine, and many are unfit to preach. So this argument muſt either plead for the reſtraint of both powers, or of neither. Let us then ſee what muſt be the remedy of this abuſe of the power of order, and the remedy of the abuſe of the other muſt be proportionable: ſure the remedy is not to reſtrain the exerciſe of the power of preaching (except it be for a time, in expectation of their amendment, which holdeth alſo with reference to ruling power) but to put ſuch unfit men out of the Miniſtry. Were it fit to lay the work of an Heretical Preacher upon a Curate, and let him ſtill have the charge of the Flock, though his Curate doth the work for him? No, but he ſhould be removed, and another put in his place: Even ſo, they who are unfit to rule, muſt not have a Biſhop do it for them, but be removed, that other fit men may be put in their place; ſeeing ruling abilities are a neceſſary qualification of a Miniſter, as well as preaching abilities, as was ſhewed before. If Parity breed Factions, we muſt cenſure the guilty, not croſs Chriſts Inſtitutions in the exerciſe of that power he hath given.

Sect. 21. 3. It is not good ſenſe that he ſaith, (ſpeaking of the power of Juriſdiction) that though it belong habitually, and in *actu primo* to all, yet in a conſtituted Church, ſome further Authority is neceſſary, beſides the power of order. Whether this be the Printers fault, or the Authors, I know not: but ſure,

the

the power of order is no part of that Authority by which the power of Juriſdiction is exerciſed. 4. He leaveth us in ſuſpence about the power of reſtraining the exerciſe of the power of Juriſdiction; for he implieth, that it may be done by the conſent of the Paſtors, or by the appointment of the Magiſtrate, or both. If this power that Chriſt hath given his Servants may be taken from them in its exerciſe, it is very fit we ſhould know to whom the Lord hath given leave to do this. I believe, and have proved that no man may do it; but if it may be done, ſure it is not thus left at randome, that it ſhould be *primi occupantis*: Paſtors themſelves cannot do it, for they have got the charge; and they, not the Biſhop whom they entruſt, muſt give an account: The Magiſtrate may not do it, for he is no ruler of the Church; but this is the higheſt act of ruling the Church, and of ruling and diſpoſing of the Rulers of it as he pleaſeth; and if neither may do it, both may not do it, ſeeing the reaſons brought exclude both from any meaſure of power in that thing. I do not ſtand on the Authority of *Camero* (which is all the proof he hath for his opinion) cited *p.* 198. viz. *Ordinatio non fit à Paſtore quatenus Paſtor eſt, ſed quatenus ad tempus ſingulare authoritatem obtinet:* Neither ſhall I ſtrive to ſtrain it to a ſound ſenſe; but be ſatisfied with the truth, that we have upon better grounds than *Camero*'s Authority eſtabliſhed, *viz.* that Ordination, and other acts of Church-power, are done by Paſtors, not by virtue of any ſuperadded power, or Delegation that they have from men, above what Chriſt hath given them in their Paſtoral Office, but by vertue of that power he hath given to all Paſtors, though the conveniency of exerciſing it, *hic & nunc*, requires the concurring of ſome more circumſtances: *Ergo*, that other Paſtors joyn in Ordination; that it be not without the limits which are fixed (for order) for the inſpection of

that

that Society of Paſtors, whereof ſuch an one is a Member; or if it be without theſe limits, that it be not without a ſpecial Call from them, who ſhould there exerciſe their Authority. The Concluſion of our Author needeth ſmall Animadverſion, ſuppoſing what hath been already ſaid: By this, ſaith he, we may already underſtand how lawful the exerciſe of an Epiſcopal power may be in the Church of God (yea, by what we have ſaid may be ſeen how unlawful it is) ſuppoſing the equality of the power of order: (But we muſt alſo ſuppoſe (and it hath been yielded) the equality of the power of Juriſdiction, at leaſt in *actu primo*; and that may ſhew us the unlawfulneſs of Epiſcopacy.) And how incongruouſly they ſpeak, who ſuppoſing an equality in the Presbyters of the Church at firſt, do cry out that the Church takes upon her the Office of Chriſt, if ſhe delegates any to a more peculiar exerciſe of the power of Juriſdiction: Yea, we have made it appear, that they ſpeak moſt congruouſly to the thing; for it is Chriſts Office to give the exerciſe of power to ſuch men, by giving them the Office on which it followeth; and therefore they who take it from them, and give it to them to whom he gave it not, do take his Office. But it is a mincing of the matter, to talk of a more peculiar exerciſe of the power of Juriſdiction; when indeed, ſetting up of a Biſhop, is a laying others aſide from the exerciſe of it at all, and ſuffering them to do nothing that way, but by his Authority: yea, that which we have all this while diſputed againſt, is yet leſs intollerable than is our caſe, where Biſhops have moſt abſolute and Lordly powers, and delegate it to whom they will, Lay-men or others, and Presbyters have no power at all.

Sect. 22. Another Argument he propoundeth, *p.* 198. from the perfection of Scripture, from which it doth much derogate, to ſay, that in it Chriſt hath

not

not laid down an immutable form of Church-Government. This Argument he almoſt tuſheth at; but that is eaſier than to anſwer it ſolidly: Unto it he bringeth three Anſwers, all which will not make up a ſatisfactory one. The firſt is the perfection of the Scripture here meant, is in reference to its end (this I grant) which is to be an adequate Rule of Faith and manners, and ſufficient to bring men to Salvation; which is ſufficiently acknowledged to be, if all things neceſſary to be believed or practiſed, be contained in the Word of God: Now that which we aſſert, not to be fully laid down in Scripture, is not pleaded to be any ways neceſſary, nor to be a matter of Faith, but ſomething left to the Churches liberty. *Reply.* I perceive it to be ordinary with this Author (I obſerved it before) to ſlight with confidence that which he hath little to ſay againſt in reaſon. What a pittiful come off is this? that the not determining the form of Government is not againſt the perfection of the Scripture, becauſe it is not a thing neceſſary, but left to the Churches liberty: What it is to beg the queſtion, if this be not, I know not; for the queſtion is, whether the form be determined in Scripture, or left to the Churches liberty: the latter he maintaineth, we aſſert the former, and prove it, becauſe otherwiſe the Scripture were imperfect: He anſwereth, it doth not follow that the Scripture is imperfect, becauſe the form of Government is left to the Churches liberty. Is this the eaſie diſpatch of this Argument which was promiſed? 2. If the end of Scripture be to be an adequate Rule of Faith and manners; then ſure, in a ſpecial way, of Religious manners or practiſes, among which is the way of managing Church-Government, being a Religious thing; for we ſpeak of Government as it is peculiar to the Church: hence then it muſt belong to its perfection to lay down this, eſpecially

cially seeing the Scripture hath told us, that this is one of its particular ends, to direct the Pastors of the Church how to behave themselves in the House of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. but this it cannot do compleatly, without setting down a form of Government, for general Rules will not tell a Pastor whether he must exercise his ruling power with others, or lay it over on my Lord Bishop; *Ergo*, the want of this form in Scripture doth derogate from that perfection which our Author confesseth to be in it. 3. By things necessary, I hope he doth not mean only necessary to salvation, but necessary to these particular ends propounded in the Scripture, one of which is the right managing of Church-Government. Now if all things necessary to this be laid down in Scripture, there cannot want a form of Government in it, for without that Government cannot be managed. His second answer is, that the doing of a thing not contained in Scripture, with an opinion of its necessity, doth destroy the Scriptures perfection; and so in that sense every *additio perficiens* is *corrumpens*; such are the Popish Traditions; but the doing of a thing without the opinion of its necessity doth not destroy it. *Reply*. This is a poorer shift than the other: For 1. It is not the adding of a form of Government to what is in Scripture that we make unlawful, or against the Scriptures sufficiency; for sure if it be not in Scripture, it must be added, seeing Nature maketh it necessary: but it is the opinion of its not being in Scripture that we plead against; and therefore this Answer doth not at all touch the Argument, neither is the example of Popish Traditions to the purpose; for we do not say that they are against Scripture perfection, because they are held not to be found in it, (for that is most true) but because they are thought needful to be added to it. 2. It is against the perfection of Scripture to say any addition to it is necessary for attaining

taining its end; whether that particular thing added to it be neceſſary, or its defect may be as well ſupplied by another thing of that kind; as if any ſhould maintain that we muſt have more Sacraments than are in Scripture, and ſhould not think this in particular neceſſary, but leave it to the Churches liberty, what particular Sacrament ſhould be ſuperadded: But Maſter *Stillingfleet*'s Opinion maketh an addition neceſſary, *viz.* that there be a form of Government which is not in Scripture, though it leave the particular form to the Churches liberty; *Ergo*, it is againſt the perfection of Scripture; and this addition being of a thing in its general nature neceſſary to an end that the Scripture aimeth at, *viz.* the right governing of the Church, and not being found in Scripture, ſo much as that men may determine it, it is ſuch an *additio perficiens* as the Author confeſſeth to be *corrumpens*. 3. By this Anſwer, none of the Popiſh Traditions are additions to the Scripture, or imply its imperfection; for though they be held neceſſary in the general, yet in particular they cannot ſo be held; for either they were freely determined by the Church, and ſo they might not have been, and therefore are not neceſſary, or the Church was neceſſitated to determine them by ſome antecedent objective truth in the things: if ſo, they muſt be the Dictates of Nature, which are no additions to Scripture; wherefore this Anſwer deſtroyeth it ſelf. 4. At leaſt, by this Anſwer, all the Popiſh and Prelatical Ceremonies, and whatſoever ſuperſtitious men can deviſe to bring into the worſhip of God, is no addition to the Scripture, nor a blot upon its perfection; for theſe are not held for neceſſary things, but indifferent, and only neceſſary when commanded by Authority; which neceſſity, I ſuppoſe, Mr. *Stilling.* will plead for to his form of Government. Now this Conſequence I hope he will not own; wherefore he may be aſhamed to

own

own that from which it doth ſo clearly follow. His third Anſwer is yet of leſs weight, *viz.* that the Eſſentials of Church Government are in Scripture, not the Circumſtantials. *Reply.* If he meaneth, as ſure he doth, the Eſſentials of Government in its general and abſtract notion, in which it is not practicable without a particular form, he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe: The Scripture may be an imperfect rule for Church-Government, though it have theſe; if he mean the Eſſentials of a particular form, he deſtroyeth his own cauſe. Now we maintain, that to the perfection of Scripture there is required not only a general notion of Government, but ſo much as is ſufficient light to direct the practice of Government: this cannot be without the inſtitution of a particular form, for Government otherwiſe is not practicable. If it be ſaid, that the general rules in Scripture about Government want nothing requiſite for the compleat practiſe of Government, but the determination of circumſtances, which cannot belong to Scripture perfection. *Anſ.* This we deny (if by general Rules he means, as ſure he doth, ſuch as do not determine a particular form) it is ſome more than a circumſtance, whether Paſtors exerciſe that power Chriſt hath given them, or commit it to a Biſhop. I hope it is more than a bare circumſtance in Civil Government, whether the power be in the hand of one, or a few, or all the people, even ſo 'tis here: yea, herein lieth the very Eſſence of a form of Government; if this then be not found in Scripture, the Eſſentials of a form are wanting; but a form is eſſential to Government, conſidered as practicable; *Ergo*, ſome of the Eſſentials of Government are wanting.

CAP. V.

CHAP. V.

HAving refuted as he ſuppoſed the general Arguments, for a particular Form of Church-Government to have been laid down in Scripture; he cometh now to particular Arguments, which are brought for ſome one Form, and many he taketh much pains to refute in this Chapter, which I am confident never any did make Uſe of to prove what he oppoſeth. We ſhall let him paſs with his ſuppoſed Victory over theſe, and only take notice of what oppoſeth the Truth we hold, or the Arguments by which it is eſtabliſhed. I ſhall only note, not inſiſt upon his large Harangue, by which in the beginning of this Chapter, he chargeth all who are not as Sceptical about Church-Government as himſelf, with prejudice, and following cuſtome and education, rather than truth, and being loth to quit that opinion, though falſe, which once they have been engaged in. To which I ſay nothing, but let every one ſearch his own Conſcience, and ſee what grounds his Perſwaſion ſtandeth upon. I hope the ſincerity of many will be able to bear them out before God, and the ſolid Reaſons they are able to produce will make them ſtand before men, againſt ſuch reproaches of this Adverſary. Neither ſhall I retaliate this his charity with the Jealouſies of many who fear that they who caſt Church-Government thus looſe, that the Magiſtrate may diſpoſe of it at his Pleaſure, do fetch the ſtrength of their Arguments, and the life of their perſwaſion, from no better Topicks then deſign to pleaſe them who can reward this their pains, or to hold faſt that which is good (as ſome have ſpoken of their fat Benefices) what ever ſide of the World be uppermoſt, to which end this opinion is a notable mean. I deſire to judge no man, the Lord will ere long judge our opinions and motives too: but this I am ſure of, we have no Worldly baits to allure us at this time, to plead for the Divine Right of Presbyteral Government, and if the Intereſt of Chriſt did not more move us than our own, we might

with much Worldly advantage yield the cauſe. We do not inſiſt on any of Chriſts acts towards the *Apoſtles* in calling them, ſending them out either firſt or laſt, as Arguments for the Form of Church-Government; knowing that their Office being Extraordinary and Temporal, can be no Rule for the ordinary caſes of the Church. Wherefore I paſs over all that he writeth in this Chap. till *p.* 218. Where he undertaketh to vindicate two places of Scripture from determining Parity or Imparity in the Church. The firſt is *Mat.* 20. 25. to which is parallel *Luk.* 22. 25. *The Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe Authority over them, and they that exerciſe authority over them, are called Benefactors: but ye ſhall not be ſo.* Though I confeſs, there be other places more unqueſtionable to our purpoſe; yet I ſee not the weight of what he hath ſaid againſt this place, being brought as an Argument againſt Imparity. His Anſwer is made up of two, Firſt, he aſſerteth, and ſolidly proveth againſt *Papiſts*, that it is not the abuſe of Power that is here forbidden, but that the Power it ſelf ſpoken of is forbidden, as incompetent to Church-Officers; his Proofs for this I need not repeat, I accept it of him as a Conceſſion. Secondly, He ſaith it is only Civil Power that is here forbidden; and ſo it doth not make againſt Imparity in Church-Officers, *Reply.* He keepeth his wonted way here, which is to take much pains, to prove what is leaſt in debate with the adverſaries he dealeth with: we do not queſtion but the Power it ſelf, not the abuſe of it is here ſpoken againſt: but that it is Civil Power only we queſtion; and that he hath not ſpent one word to prove. We affirm that Chriſt is here making a difference between his Apoſtles and Civil Governors in this; that one of them ſhould not have Authority over another, as it is among Rulers of States and Kingdoms; and ſo that there ſhould be no Imparity of Power among them; to prove this, I borrow the 3*d* reaſon by which Mr. *Still.* militateth againſt the abuſe of Power being here meant, *viz.* This only can anſwer the Scope of the Apoſtles contention, which was about Primacy. The Sons of *Zebedee* would have been ſet over the reſt, *Mat.* 20.

20. and their Strife was, which ſhould be μείζων pro μέγας. (ſo *Druſius* cited by *Leigh Crit. Sac.*) that is, who ſhould be Pope over the reſt: now, though we deny not but theirs might be upon a Civil and Coactive Power, they dreaming of an earthly Kingdome of Chriſt, yet ſure, this was neither mainly nor only in their deſign: not only, becauſe they could not but know that Chriſts Kingdome, in which they were to be Officers, ſhould be Spiritual, and converſant about the things of another life, though they thought it might be Worldly to, and therefore it could not be; but they deſigned a Supremacy in that reſpect alſo, not mainly, both becauſe they could not but know that their main work both in teaching and ruling, was to be about the things of Eternity: as alſo it is evident from *Luk.* 22. 24. that their contention was about Supremacy in a Power that then they had begun to be partakers of, τὶς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων: but they knew very well that yet they had no Civil Power: ſeeing then they contended about Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy, and Chriſts anſwer is ſuted to their Intention, and doth wholly diſcharge that Power whereof it ſpeaketh: the firſt of which I have proved; the two latter Mr. *Still.* hath confeſſed: it followeth, that Chriſt doth here forbid all Superiority of the Apoſtles, one over another: ſo that not only Chriſt had not ſet one over the reſt but he will not permit themſelves to do it if they would: οὐχ οὕτως is a Simple forbidding of it. Hence I inferre the Argument to our purpoſe thus, if the Apoſtles who had received equal power from Chriſt, might not delegate that Power to one whom they might ſet up as chief; then Presbyters may not do this neither, *Ergo* Imparity of Presbyters is unlawful. The conſequence is evident, the antecedent I prove from parity of Reaſon: it is not imaginable that Presbyters may ſet one of themſelves over themſelves: and that Biſhops may not do the like, and Apoſtles the like; ſeeing order may require the one as well as the other. Yea, Secondly, if there be a diſparity of reaſon it maketh much for us, for ſure the Apoſtles had more

liberty of managing that Power, they had received from Christ, by prudence, than Pastors now have; wherefore they might far rather restrain the exercise of it in themselves, if they saw cause, than we may do. 3. I hope it will not be denied, that what is here said to the Apostles is not said to them as Apostles; but as Officers of the Church, who have received the same Power from Christ: that it is no Temporary, but an abiding precept: and therefore if it forbid superiority among the Apostles, so doth it among Presbyters, Mr. *Still.* p. 220. objecteth thus; 'this place doth no waies imply a Prohibition of all inequality among Governours of the Church; for then the Apostles Power over ordinary Pastors should be forbidden. Ans. *concedo totum*: we also grant inequality among Pastors and Elders. But that which we plead is, that here is forbidden an inequality among them who are of the same Order: that when Christ hath given men the same Power and Office, as he did to the Apostles; they may not usurp power one over another, nor take it though others would give it them. This is clearly proved from what hath been said. And further, it may be hence also concluded, that the inequality which is among Church-Officers ought not to be such as is among the Governours of the World, where a single Person may have his under-Officers at his command: but that inequality must be of one order above another in place and rank, both which do concur jointly to the ruling of the Church; and thus also Episcopacy is here made unlawful. That Pride and Ambition is here forbidden, I readily grant him: but that these are not only forbidden, is clear from what hath been said.

Sect. 2. The next place that he considereth is *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17. Where, after private admonition is used in vain, we are commanded to tell the Church; and they who do not hear the Church, are to be counted as Heathens and *Publicans*. That which he first bringeth for an Answer to this place is, 'That because men of all Opinions about 'Church-Government make Use of it to establish their Opi-'nions, therefore no Argument may be drawn from it for

'any

any opinion. This unhappy way of reaſoning I have met with before, and inſiſt not now on it. It is the Devils way, I perceive, to raiſe contentions about truth among ſome; and having done this, to tempt others by theſe contentions to Schiſm and ſlighting of truth. But we muſt not quit the light held forth in this Scripture, becauſe men have darkened it, by their raiſing duſt about it: let us ſearch the more ſoberly and carefully, not caſt away the truth for this. Yet for all divers Opinions that have been broached about this place, Mr. *Stilling.* hath a new one of his own, which I ſhall briefly examine. 'The difficulty of the place (he 'ſaith well) lyeth in theſe two. 1. What are the offences 'here ſpoken of. 2. What is the Church mentioned. For 'the firſt, he aſſerteth (with more confidence than ſtrength 'of Reaſon, when he ſaith, it is evident to any unprejudi-'cated mind,) that the matters are not of ſcandal; but of 'private offence and injurie: this he proveth *p.* 222. (his 'Arguments we ſhall conſider after.) For the Church, he propoſeth at length the *Eraſtian* opinion, as very plauſible: yet at laſt rejecteth it *p.* 224, 225. and returns to the Offences *p.* 226. 'which though he makes to be private diffe-'rences and quarrels; yet he will not have them to be law-'ſuits, nor Civil cauſes; but ſuch differences as reſp. & per-'ſons, and not things. And then he determineth *p.* 227. 'that the Church is not here any Juridical Court acting 'by Authority; but a ſelect Company, who by arbitration may 'compoſe and end the difference: and ſo concludeth *p.* 228. 'that here is nothing about Church-Government; though 'by Analogie ſome things about it may be hence drawn. This is the ſum of this opinion, which I ſhall firſt refute and then conſider his grounds for it.

Sect. 3. And firſt of all I cannot but wonder that this learned Author ſhould with ſo much confidence deny this place to ſpeak of Church-Government; and not ſay ſomething in anſwer to the many Arguments for eſtabliſhing a Form of Government, which are drawn from it by many Learned men; as *Gilleſpy* in his *Aarons* Rod. *Rutherford* in his *Jus Divin. Reg. Eccleſ. Beza de Excom. & Preſbyt. Cawdry*

dry of Church-reformation; and other Presbyterians: beside many Authors of other judgments. What? are all their Arguments unworthy to be taken notice of, and eatily blown away with Mr. *Still.* his bare Assertion? for what he saith of the matters of offence spoken of in this place, he seemeth to aim at a new opinion, but I cannot see wherein it differeth from what the *Erastians* hold, save in its obscurity; for when he hath with them, made them to be no Scandals, nor Sins against God, but private injuries against our Neighbours, he will not have them to be Civil causes, or Law-suits; but such differences as respect Persons, not things. What these can be I cannot understand. for what wrong can I do to my Neighbour besides scandalising him by Sin against God, for which he may not Sue me at Law? if he mean not matters of Money or *meum & tuum*, but other injuries against ones Person, as beating, reproaches, slanders &c. (as I guess he doth, so far as I can see his opinion through the midst of his words) these are yet Civil causes, and matters of Law-Suit: and this is the one part of what the *Erastians* here understand: neither do I see any reason for understanding these here, and not other private Injuries, as the *Erastians* do: for is it imaginable that Christ would prescribe this course for redress of wrongs in our own Persons and names, and not also for wrongs in our Estates? but it may be he meaneth that though the injuries here meant, be in matters Civil; yet the design of the place is not to prescribe a way of making up the injury, but of taking away the animosities, and quarrels that these injuries breed among Christians, but this cannot hold; for sure the best way of allaying the animosities that arise about injuries done by one to another, must be by determining what is the due of each, and who doth, and who sustaineth the wrong, and so making reparation of the injury done. We must not then think that Christ hath appointed one course for repairing the wrong; and another for taking away contention about it: but it is his Will that Christians in such cases, either let their wrongs be judged by the arbitration of Friends; or if that cannot be,

by

by that law: and whethersoever of these waies the matter be determined; that they should acquiesce, and not contend any more. Besides this, when I receive a private injurie from another, it is my duty to lay aside all grudge and animosity against him, which if I be willing to do, why should the matter be brought before others, or to the Church? if I be not willing to do it, it is not like that I will bring it thus to others, who may persuade me to lay aside animosity against him. I cannot understand how I can bring a matter of private wrong to be judged by others, except it be in reference to the getting of some reparation of that wherein I conceive my self to be wronged. If he mean that I should bring the matter before others, not that my animosity may be laid aside (that being my duty without such adoe) but that they may persuade him who hath wronged me to lay aside his grudg, and be reconciled to me: sure this cannot be the Scope of the place, both because Christ giveth another rule in that Case, which will sooner attain that end, *viz.* Forgive him, *Lu.* 17. 3. and indeed it is a more compendious way to allay his fury, to carry it dutifully, friendly and kindly to him, than to convent him before others. Also because it is a strange reflection of the Sence of the expression, Trespass against thee *i. e.* refuse to be reconciled to thee: sure there is no Warrant in Scripture or reason from the notation of the word, thus to expound it. And besides all this, this exposition destroys the Authors opinion, *viz.* that this place is not meant of Scandals; for when one hath wronged me, and I am willing to forgive him and be at peace with him, and he refuseth to be reconciled to me; this is a Sin against God, and a Scandal of an high nature. Now why the place should be meant of taking away this sort of Scandal and no other (seeing other Scandals also are Sins against the Scandalized, as is clear 1 *Cor.* 8. 12.) I think it is hard to conjecture except Mr. *Still.* must say so to make up the opinion that he intendeth to defend.

Sect. 4. But I shall now prove that this place speaketh purposely of Scandals, or Sins against God, whereby the

Conſciences of others are offended; and not of private Injuries. And that briefly becauſe this is largely and fully performed by all our Authors who write againſt *Eraſtians*. 2. Our Lord had ſpent the former part of the Chapter about Scandals, eſpecially in preſſing your ſhunning to give offence, and in ſhewing the danger of offences; both to the offended, and eſpecially to the offender, *verſ.* 7. Now in all this diſcourſe he had ſaid nothing of the means of taking away of Scandals: wherefore ſeeing he joyneth theſe words we diſpute about, to the former diſcourſe of Scandal; it may be out of queſtion that he is here laying down that way of removing theſe Scandals when they ſhould ariſe in his Church, that the evils he had ſpoken of may not enſue upon them. 2. The deſign of this Remedy here preſcribed is to gain the faulty Perſon: now this expreſſion of gaining Men from that which is Evil, is in Scripture only uſed in reference to Sins againſt God, which are apt to deſtroy men, and whereby they are loſt. 3. this evil from which the Perſon is to be gained, is Sin or Scandal If it be ſaid that it is gaining of a brother, when he is Perſuaded to lay aſide animoſity againſt a brother, and to be reconciled to him; this is true only and ſo far as ſuch animoſity is Sin: for on no other account, freeing of one from it can be called gaining him in Scripture-Phraſe; and if theſe animoſities be here ſpoken of only as they are Scandals, then the Scope of the place is to redreſs Scandals; for *à quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia.* 3. To ſin againſt a brother is (in the Phraſe of the New Teſtament) mainly, if not only, to wrong his Conſcience or Spiritual Eſtate by Scandal. 1 *Cor.* 8. 12. or to be guilty of Sin againſt God in his ſight or conſcience *Luk.* 15. 18, 21. ſo *Luk.* 17. 3, 4. Neither can any inſtance be brought where it ſignifies a private injury as ſuch; therefore it muſt be meant of Scandal. 4. In redreſſing of private Injuries in a charitable way, it is not uſual to lead Witneſſes: but theſe belong to a judicial proceeding; but here the matter is to be eſtabliſhed by Witneſſes. *Ergo* it is a matter not to be tranſacted in ſuch a way as this Author would have theſe private Injuries. 5. It is unimaginable

imaginable that Christ would have us count our Brother a Heathen or a Publican, and would have him bound in Heaven for persisting in a fact that either is no sin against God, or which is not considered as a sin against God: doth the Holy Ghost any where speak so of private injuries, considered as such? no sure; but if private injuries are to be thus noted with censure by God and Men, it is under the notion of heinous sins as they offend God and scandalize his people, and if so: then Scandals are here meant; for if such injuries be here spoken of for that which is common to other Scandals, and especially private injuries not particularly mentioned, but set down under the general name of Sin; what a boldness is it to exclude other sins, and make these only to be here spoken of?

Sect. 5. Next, I come to consider his Notion about the Church, to which these offences must at last be brought for remedy: 'It is, saith he, no juridical Court, but a se-'lect company called together by the party offended, who 'by arbitration may compose and end the difference. Against this Conceit I bring these Reasons: 1. This company is to be called together by the offended party; for the Text carrieth the whole managing of the business to be by him; and it is very like the stubborn offender will not be active in this: now, is this a way that our Lord would prescribe for taking away the distemper of a galled mind, that his Adversary (so the stubborn offender looketh upon the other) should chuse the persons before whom he is to be convented, and who should judg him? this I cannot be induced to believe, except I see more proof of it than our Author's bare saying it is so. 2. We must conceive that these three steps of proceeding here prescribed, have some notable difference one from another, and are remedies of different Vertues and operations applyed to this stubborn Disease. Now the first step is secret Admonition: the second is Private and Charitable, not Judicial; the third then must be different from both: which I cannot conceive how it is, if it be not authoritative. In this Authors opinion,

it

it is no more but this, when two or three Friends cannot accommodate the matter, then take a few more, having no more but the same power the former two or three had: now what great influence can 5, or 6, or 10 have to persuade a stiff offender, more than 2 or or 3 using the same motives? 'tis not to be imagined that the difference can be such as Christ intendeth when he prescribeth this as a remedy of that evil the other could not cure. 3. When Christ is here prescribing a cure for offences which may fall out among his people, and is so exact in describing all the steps of it and final result thereof; we must conceive that his last cure will be such as will effectually root out that evil so, as that it do not any more hurt his Church or those who are harmed by it. Now if the last mean be only arbitration, and no juridical authoritative act, this end can never be attained: for neither is the stubborn offender gained, nor is he taken away that he may not the same way trouble the other party as before. What great matter is gained if the wilful party will not hear this advising Church our Author dreameth of? he is still a Church-member, enjoying the publick fellowship of the people of God, for all that these arbitrators can do: and suppose some do withdraw private intimacy with them, yet we cannot think that all are obliged to it by the authority of private arbitrators declaring him stubborn, when all do not know the causes which made them so determine, nor the proofs that did convince them of the truth of what was alledged against him. It is then evident that this last Remedy of the miscarriage (be what it will) of a stubborn offender which Christ here prescribeth, is an authoritative act, and therefore the Church here is no company of private men for arbitration. 4. Though we grant that the word ἐκκλησία signifieth any company called together, yet here it must be of more restricted signification; and must needs signify a company called out of the World by the Gospel to worship God, and to serve him in the managing of his affairs and institutions; which is not applicable to a company of arbitrators called by a man, not by the Gospel, to agree contending parties, which is a work of duty common

to

to all the World, and none of the ſpecial works of the Church as diſtinguiſhed from other Societies. Now that the word *Church* muſt be thus underſtood, and not as Mr. *Stilling.* would have it, I prove 2dly; It is conſtantly ſo uſed by the Writers of holy Scripture; neither can an inſtance be brought in all the New Teſtament where any ever put *Eccleſia* for a company met about any buſineſs, ſave that the Town-Clerk of *Epheſus* uſed it otherwiſe, *Acts* 19. 39. and *Luke*, ſpeaking of him in his own dialect, uſeth it as he did, *ver.* 40. But when Chriſt here ſpeaketh of a Church to which he ſendeth his offended people by a ſtanding Law for the redreſs of their grievances, we muſt certainly conceive that he will have them by the *Church*, to underſtand that which is ordinarily known by that name in the New Teſtament; for how ſhould they know the meaning of an ambiguous word, but by the conſtant Uſe of it in the Scripture? 2. The demonſtrative article added in the Greek putteth the matter beyond all queſtion, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ſignifieth a particularly deſigned Church, which they to whom it is ſaid, have pointed out unto them: not any Church, this or that, an *individuum vagum*, or ſuch a Church as themſelves may particularize or pitch upon: it is not [a] Church, but [the] Church. Now a company of Arbitrators choſen *ad libitum* by the grieved party, are not ἡ ἐκκλησία [the] Church particularly, as *individuum determinatum* deſigned by Chriſt; they are at beſt but [a] Church, and ſhould be here deſigned only *confuſè*, or *vage*, *huic aut illi eccleſiæ*, which the word cannot bear. Now if we take it for a Ruling-church, or whatever Church in Scripture-ſenſe, it is here determined what Church we ſhould bring the matter to, *viz.* that particular Church we live in (at leaſt in *prima inſtantia*) and it is not left to our liberty to chuſe what Church of many particulars we will complain unto. Or if we take the article here prefixed to denote the ἐξοχὴν of that Church here ſpoken of, and to determine the word to its *famoſius ſignificatum*; it hath the ſame ſtrength of an argument: for, not a company of

private

private Arbitrators, but Christians, or their Representatives met for the worship of God, or administration of the affairs of his House, are that Church.

Sect. 6. I come now to examine what Mr. *Stilling.* hath to say against this interpretation of the place, or for that which himself hath devised. *P.* 222. he undertaketh to prove that the Offence here spoken of is not any scandal or Sin against God, but a private injury. 'His arguments are, '1. from the parallel place, *Luke* 17. 3. *If thy brother tres-*'*pass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him*; 'this is private injury, because a private Brother may for-'give it, which is not in his power were it a scandal to the 'whole Church, unless we make every private person to 'excommunicate and release one another. *Answ.* That *Luke* 17. 3, 4. is parallel to *Matth.* 18. 15, 16, 17. I do not question; and indeed all the Commentators that I have met with, make them relate to the same passage of Christs preaching: but this (if we may lay any weight on the judgment of men) doth make much against Mr. *Still.* for he understandeth *Matth.* 18. not of Scandals, but of the bare injury, so then must this place also, but the Text and context both do make it evident, as I conceive, that this place is not meant of Private Injuries (but in so far as they are Scandals) but of scandalous sins: I say the context doth prove it; because our Lord is there speaking of Scandals: it is the very purpose that he is upon *ver.* 1, 2. The Text also proveth it, for the first remedy to be applyed to this evil, is Rebuke: which is known to be a more proper remedy for Scandal than private wrong: and then, the fruit of this remedy, Repentance, doth relate to Scandals rather than to private wrongs. Neither doth it follow that it is private injury, because a private person may forgive it; for we must understand it of private Scandal, not such as is publick, and a scandal to the whole Church, as Mr. *Still.* supposeth. Now when the Offender repenteth upon private Rebuke, the Rebuker may forgive him 3 ways: 1. By not charging him any more with guiltiness, but looking on him, as one whom the Lord hath pardoned. That this is

called

called *forgiveneſs* in Scripture, is clear, 2 *Cor.* 2. 7, 10. where the whole Church is commanded thus to forgive the excommunicated man who had repented. 2. By exerciſing that Chriſtian familiar love toward him, which we ought not to exerciſe towaad them who live in ſin. 3. By forbearing to bring the matter to any more publick hearing, which, had not the party repented, had been his duty. Now this giveth not a power of Excommunicating and releaſing to a private perſon; but only a power of the prudent Uſe of our own charity. His ſecond Anſwer is the ſame, only built on another Scripture, *Matth.* 18. 20. 'Where 'Chriſt in anſwer to *Peter*'s Queſtion, bids us *forgive our bro-* 'ther as oft as he repenteth. The anſwer is alſo the ſame; for we muſt forgive a ſcandalous Brother (in the way but now laid down) as oft as he repenteth; and not bring him to publick Rebuke, but in caſe of obſtinacy. His 3d. argument is this, If this be matter of Scandal that is here ſpoken of; then might a matter of Scandal be brought before the Church when there is no way to decide it, there being but one privy to it, who is the Accuſer, he affirmeth, and the Offender denyeth. *Anſw.* 1. Doth not this ſame inconvenience follow if the matter be a private Injury? May there not in that caſe be no way for the Arbitrators to decide the matter, the Offender denying, and the injured party affirming, and that where himſelf is the party? The Objecter then is as much obliged to anſwer this argument as we are. But 2dly, This inconvenience is eaſily avoided thus: if the grieved perſon be the only witneſs of the fact, and the offender deny the fact, it ought not to come before the Church, neither is this injunction to be underſtood of ſuch caſes: but where either the fact is known to more than one (for even ſo it may be a private and no publick offence) or where the Offender doth not deny the fact; but denyeth that it is wrong: in that caſe, firſt two or three, then the whole Church muſt endeavour to convince him. It is a bad conſequence; ſome works of darkneſs, for want of witneſs, cannot be decided by the Church; *Ergo*, We are not commanded to bring ſcandals before the Church.

Church. That which he addeth *p.* 223. 'That Christ here 'speaketh as to an ordinary case, and in allusion to what 'was then in Use among the *Jews*; which was to reprove 'one another, commanded *Lev.* 19. 17. and for neglect of 'which, *Jerusalem* was thought to be destroyed by *R. Chan-* 'na. This I say, is nothing to the purpose; for I suppose these Reproofs, *Lev.* 19. 17. and which are mentioned by that Rabby, were not only for private Injuries, but mainly for sin against God: wherefore this consideration maketh not a little against the design for which it was brought. *P.* 224. 'He will not have the Church here 'spoken of to be the Christian Church; because, saith he, 'Christ is speaking to a present case, and layeth down a 'present Remedy. Now if he lay down Rules for go-'verning his Church; this could not be, because there 'were yet no Ecclesiastical Courts for them to appeal to: if 'then the case had presently fallen out, they were left with-'out a redress, having no Church to tell it unto. *Ans.* It cannot be proved that Christ here layeth down Rules for a case presently practicable, more than he doth when he impowereth his Apostles, and chargeth them concerning their work, *Matth.* 16. 19. *John* 20. 23. *Mat.* 28. 19. and yet will have them to delay a while before they should put all that power in act. *Luke* 24. 49. And indeed we have far better cause to think that he is telling his people what to do in the after and ordinary times of his Church, than what they should do in that present and extraordinary case, when the Church was not yet framed, and when they had himself personably to go to for direction. 2dly, However we maintain that this Rule, as it serveth for our times, so might it serve for that time in which it was spoken: for, if the case had then fallen out, though there were not the ordinary Ecclesiastical Courts to go to, that now ought to be, yet there wanted not a visible Church-power residing in the person of Christ, and after in the Apostles, to whom did succeed the ordinary Judicatures: so that the offended party wanted never a Church to make his complaint unto. I do not say that [*Tell the Church*] doth directly signifie

any

any other to which the complaint was to be made, but the ordinary guides of the Church; for our Lord accommodateth his terms he uſeth to the ordinary caſes in which this Law was to take place; but by Analogie, it is applicable to any who in extraordinary caſes act the part of the ordinary Guides of the Church.

Sect.7. I agree to the argument of Mr.*Gilleſpy*, cited by the Author, that unleſs we underſtand the word Church as uſually, it would be no eaſie matter to know what Chriſt here meaneth by the Church; for ſeeing this was to be a ſtanding Law in all Ages, 'tis not imaginable that the Lord would have us otherwiſe underſtand the terms of it than they are ordinarily uſed in the Bible, which he intended ſhould conſtantly be in his Peoples hands. Neither is that of any weight which our Author oppoſeth to this; that ſuch as ſo argue would do well to conſider, how thoſe to whom Chriſt ſpake, ſhould apprehend his meaning, if he ſpake in a ſenſe they never heard of before. We conſider that they may eaſily underſtand Chriſts words, becauſe he had often before ſpoken to them of the Goſpel-church that was to be ſet up, and even in this very term of a Church, as *Matth.* 16. 19. and frequently under the notion of the *Kingdom of Heaven*; which they might eaſily apprehend to be meant by the Church. Wherefore the Author did not well conſider what he ſaid, when he ſuppoſed this language to be unknown to the Diſciples. Hence all that he ſaith of the way of underſtanding Scripture in the ſence of the words then common, is not to the purpoſe; for, Chriſt had made this ſenſe common among them. Neither muſt we underſtand the word as it was then commonly apprehended among the *Jews*, but as it was apprehended among Chriſts ordinary Hearers, who were in expectation of another Church, and another way of Government in it to be ſet up, than was then among the *Jews*. I find no more in the Author that is argumentative either againſt our opinion of this Text, or for his own. He concludeth p. 228. that this place, though it ſpeaks not of Church-government, yet it may have ſome influence on it by way

of

of Analogy, *viz.* in proving, 1. Gradual Appeals, 2. Church-cenſures, 3. The lawfulneſs of Excommunication. This he yieldeth at leaſt, that ſomething of Church-Government may be inferred from this place: then *ex conceſſis*, it is not ſo impertinent to this purpoſe as he would have made us believe in the beginning of this Chapter.

Sect. 8. But let us ſee if we can draw any more out of it than he will yield us. We have already proved it to be directly meant of Church-Government, and to give Rules for the right managing of it: now I aſſert, that it doth implicitly determine the form of Church-Government, *viz.* That it ought to be by Parity, not Epiſcopacy; which I thus make out: The firſt Authority before which the complaint of the grieved party is to be brought, is the Church, (and it is alſo the laſt:) but if the Church were governed by Biſhops, this ſhould not be, *Ergo*, The Church ought not to be governed by Biſhops. The Major is clear; for after ſecret and private admonition (which are not authoritative) immediately ſucceedeth [*Tell the Church:*] ſure this Church muſt be that Authority which we muſt go to *prima inſtantia*, and alſo that which muſt finally decide the matter; ſeeing Excommunication doth immediately follow upon Diſobliging this Authority. The Minor I prove thus: in the Epiſcopal way, the complaint muſt be brought to the Biſhop or to his Delegate or Delegates (which is all one as to the matter of Authority) and he muſt be the laſt that muſt determine, and on diſobedience to him followeth Excommunication: but the Biſhop is not the Church, *Ergo*, In the Epiſcopal way complaints cannot be made to the Church, nor doth the Church finally decide the matter. The Minor of this laſt Syllogiſm is evident; for neither the nature of the word, nor Scripture-Uſe will bear, that one Man ſhall be called the Church. If it be ſaid that Epiſcopacy be ſo modelled, as the Biſhop with the Presbyter may judg of the offence, and they may well be called the Church. *Anſw.* In that caſe, either the Presbyters have a deciſive Vote as well as the Biſhop, or they be only his Adviſers. In the firſt caſe the Biſhop is

only

only a *Præses*: which is not that Episcopacy pleaded against, though we judg it inconvenient. In the 2d, the Bishop is the only Power, and therefore there is no such Church as here meant, for the Church here is a Church cloathed with Authority, whom the party ought to hear, *i.e.* obey, and for contumacy against which he is Excommunicated: but the Bishop and his counsel is not such a Church; for his counsel hath no Authority, and himself cannot make a Church; and therefore both taken together, make no Church having Authority.

CHAP. VI.

HERE Mr. *Stilling.* doth undertake to lay aside Apostolical practice from being a pattern for us in the matter of Church-Government; What success he hath in this attempt we now examine. His two main scopes in this Chapter, are, that it cannot be known what the practice of the Apostles was in this; and that if it were known, it is no binding example to us; which desperate assertions do, not a little, reflect upon the Scripture and tend to the casting loose the Government of the Church. The latter of them I have spoken to before, and purpose to examine what he saith for it. Concerning the former, I shall premise but this to our trying of his proofs, that it is very strange the Spirit of God in Scripture hath written so much of their practice, both Historically, and implied it in Doctrinal assertions and Precepts, if for all this we cannot know what it was; which if it do not accuse the Scripture-relation of things of great imperfection, I know nothing: for I am sure the Scripture doth purposely set down much of their practice, both in Preaching, administration of Sacraments, ordination of Officers, directing these Officers in their behaviour in the House of God, censures

and other parts of Government: if yet we cannot know by Scripture what was their way in Ruling; the account given of these things must be very imperfect. I believe it would be imputed to any Writer of the History of a Church, if out of his History could not be gathered what was the Government of that Church: shall we then think that the Sacred Writers, who have undertaken to give us an account of the acts of the Apostles, are so deficient? especially many of the writings of the Apostles themselves being added by the same Spirit; out of which much may be gathered to this purpose. But let us hear how he makes out this his strange opinion. I insist not on what he writeth of the Apostles Commission; I confess the form of Government is not expressed in it: though we have ground to think, that when Christ chargeth them to teach his People to observe all he commanded them, *Matth.* 28. 20. that it was his Will that they should not leave so great a matter as is the form of Church-Government to mens Will; but that his Institution should be observed in this: especially seeing he spent 40 days with them before his Ascension, *Acts* 1. 3. speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, that is the Gospel-Church: it is hard to think that among all his Instructions to them then, he told them nothing of his Will about the way of governing his Church. Neither do I take notice of his large Discourse about the Division of Provinces among the Apostles: nor of his too true observation, that looking on ancient practice through the Glass of our own customs, hath bred many mistakes: only I wonder at his bringing that for an instance, that Lay-Elders are proved from the name *Presbyters*: I believe there was never any that used such an Argument, seeing the name is common to them and Preaching-Elders. He will find stronger arguments than this for that Order of Church-Officers, if he please to read the Assertors of it.

Sect. 2. For clearing what was Apostolical Practice he layeth down this as a foundation, *p.* 239, &c. 'That the 'Apostles in the forming Churches did observe the custom of

of the *Jewish* Synagogue. About this Notion he ſpendeth a huge deal of pains, as if the ſtrength of his cauſe lay here; but to what purpoſe it is, except to ſhew his reading and skill in Antiquity, I know not. Doth it follow, the Apoſtles imitated the *Jews* in the matter of Church-Government, *Ergo*, we are not obliged to imitate the Apoſtles? I ſhould think that the contrary conſequence might rather be inferred; but whatever be of that, this we are ſure of, that whether there was any coincidency or ſimilitude between the Apoſtolical and the Jewiſh way, or not; Whether the Apoſtles in what they did had an eye at the Jewiſh Example, or not: they were acted by an infallible Spirit, which did both guide them unerringly, and warrant them unqueſtionably to do what they did in the management of Church-Government, ſo that it is not the occaſion of their taking ſuch or ſuch a way that we are to look to, but the morality of it, that ſhould determine us to follow it, becauſe we know it is the will of Chriſt. Wherefore I might paſs without any more notice all that he writeth in many ſheets of the modelling the Government of the Church by that of the Synagogue. Yet for further clearing the matter, I ſhall lay down a few Conſiderations.

Sect. 3. First, I take notice how inconſiſtent this Author is with himſelf in this Point; for *p.* 322. he aſſerteth, 'That the Apoſtles did not obſerve (in probability) 'one fixed courſe of ſetling the Government of Churches, 'but ſetled it according to the ſeveral circumſtances of pla-'ces and perſons which they had to deal with. I hope he will not deny, but the Jewiſh way of Government was one and the ſame every where: How then did the Apoſtles imitate that, if they were ſo various in their ſetling of Government? ſure if they did not ſtick to one form, they did not ſtick to the Jewiſh form. But I perceive he would fain ſay any thing that might caſt Church-Government at an uncertainty; however the ways he taketh to this end, do claſh one with another. 2. All this pains he taketh, tendeth either to prove nothing, or to prove that which

himſelf will not own: for ſuppoſe that he had evinced that the Apoſtles did imitate the *Jews* in their Church-adminiſtrations: if any thing follow, it muſt be this, that theſe things which were done by the Apoſtles on ſuch an account are not now binding, but are indifferent and determinable by men: and that as the Apoſtles had their liberty in imitating the *Jews*, or not, ſo we have our liberty in imitating the Apoſtles, or not, in them. Now this I am ſure he dare not own in moſt of theſe things which he maketh to have been taken up from the Jewiſh cuſtoms: for he ſpeaketh, *p.* 240. 'of Chriſts taking many Rites of 'the Lords Supper from the *poſtcœnium* among the *Jews*, 'and the Uſe of Baptiſm from the Baptiſms uſed in initia-'ting Proſelytes, and Excommunication from their put-'ting out of the Synagogue; and afterward he maketh 'building of Churches, to be taken from the Synagogues: 'publick reading of the Scripture, and Paſtors from the '*Archiſynagogi*: Ordination from that uſed among the '*Jews*: Will then Mr. *Stilling.* ſay that all theſe are now 'indifferent. That Baptiſm, Excommunication, Paſtors, nay Ordination are no Inſtitutions of Chriſt; and that as the Apoſtles took them from the *Jews ad placitum*; ſo we may take them from the Apoſtles, or leave them, as we liſt. Sure he will not ſay it: and if he ſaith not this, he ſaith nothing, but *magno conatu nihil agit: parturiunt montes: naſcetur ridiculus mus.* 3. It is needful to diſtinguiſh the things that the Apoſtles did by imitation take from the *Jews*, by confounding of which Mr. *Stilling.* hath mired himſelf and his Reader too. There are 1. ſome-things that are the dictates of Nature and Reaſon: as that publick aſſembling be ordinarily in ſome one convenient place: that in a Society there be Rulers and Ruled: that where many Rule they meet together for that end: that in their meeting one preſide, to avoid confuſion, &c. 2. There are other things which be the commandments of God concerning his moral Worſhip; as that Prayers, Praiſes, pulick reading of his Word, with opening of it, that his people may know his Will, be performed in the

ſolemn

ſolemn meetings of his people. 3. God's ceremonial Worſhip, which conſiſteth in the obſervance of Rights ſacred, or peculiar to Religion, without which all that Worſhip of God might well be performed, which is, and hath been of moral and perpetual Obligation. 4. Such things as receive their uſefulneſs and fitneſs from cuſtom: as Words, Habits, Geſtures, &c. Now for the firſt two ſorts, though there was co-inciding in them, between the Jewiſh and Apoſtolical way (and indeed it could not be otherwiſe, Nature and what is of moral Obligation being the ſame unto all) yet that the Apoſtles were determined in theſe by the Jewiſh Example, we deny. For the 3d, It is clear, that the Apoſtles uſed no ſuch things with the Jewiſh Church, except a few for a time to avoid Scandal, *Acts* 15. 28. 29. Yea, they are declared unlawful to be uſed, *Gal.* 4. 9, 10. and 5. 1, 2. *Col.* 2. 16, 17. which I am elſwhere to ſhew more at length. The 4th ſort of things we hold to be in themſelves indifferent, and determinable by the laudable cuſtom of every place. Neither do we deny the Apoſtles to have in many of theſe imitated the Jewiſh Church; and no wonder, becauſe they lived among them. Now Church-Government having in it ſome things of all theſe ſorts, it is clear from what hath been ſaid, how far we confeſs the Apoſtles to have followed the *Jews* in it; and how far not. That wherein we are likeſt to controvert with Mr. *Still.* is, about things of the third ſort, which I muſt yet diſtinguiſh: they were either ſuch as the Lord had commanded to the *Jews*, or ſuch as they without his command did take up. The former, he doth not alledg that the Apoſtles followed the *Jews* in. The latter he aſſerteth, and we deny it; and ſhall anon hear what he bringeth for his Aſſertion. But for further clearing this and the whole matter, I lay down a fourth conſideration, *viz.* to make it out, that the Apoſtles did imitate the *Jews*, there are two things required. 1. To ſhew the co-incidency of their practice. 2. To ſhew that this co-incidency did proceed from a deſign of conformity, *viz.* that the Apoſtles were determined in ſuch things by the

Jewiſh Example: for the former without the other is no imitation, becauſe in imitation, the former practice muſt have ſome influence on that which followeth; ſuch as the exemplary cauſe hath on the *exemplatum*. Now if the Apoſtles did (in ſome of theſe) the ſame things with the Jewiſh Church, only accidentally, or upon other motives; and did not (as Mr. *Stilling.* phraſeth it) copy out the Jewiſh way of Government, 'tis no imitating of them.

Sect. 4. From what hath been ſaid, it will be eaſie to maintain againſt Mr. *Stilling.* large Diſcourſe, that the Apoſtles did not in the Government of the Church imitate the Jewiſh Synagogue as their Pattern; I ſhall touch ſuch things in his Diſcourſe as ſeem to prove it. And 1. I take notice of that which was occaſionally touched before, *p.*240, *viz.* 'That Chriſt delighted to take up the received practices 'among the *Jews*, as the *Poſtcœnium* he turned to the Lords 'Supper, Baptiſm of Proſelytes, imitated to Chriſtian Bap'tiſm, caſting out of the Synagogue to Excommunication. 'And this he ſaith he did with Rites, not which were ori'ginally founded on *Moſes*'s Law; but which were brought 'in by a confederate Diſcipline among themſelves. This, 'ſaith he, hath been abundantly manifeſted by many learn'ed men; of which he cited ſome in his Margin. I confeſs, many learned Men, eſpecially ſuch as have ſpent their pains in Critical Learning, have done but bad ſervice to Chriſt and his inſtitutions, while to ſerve their *Phœnomena*, and make their critical Conjectures the more plauſible, they have made Mens devices like *Mezentius* his bed to curtail or ſtretch out Chriſts Inſtitutions by them at their pleaſure. But the Authority of ſuch Men, though never ſo learned, ſhall not perſwade me (what their Reaſons may do I ſay not, till I hear and conſider them) to think that Chriſt had ſuch delight in Mens inventions in the Worſhip of God, as to make them the Pattern of his Goſpel-inſtitutions; and that rather than the Ceremonies, which of old were of divine Authority: ſhall we think that he who condemneth Mens Doctrines in Gods Worſhip, as vain, *Mal.* 15. 9. and eſpecially in that Chapter, condemneth a Ceremony

brought

brought in by confederate Diſcipline, which in it ſelf was as harmleſs as any of theſe mentioned, *viz.* often Waſhing: ſhall we think, I ſay, that he had ſuch pleaſure in theſe things? ſure he cannot be ſo unlike himſelf. Neither I am ſure can the Aſſertors of this Paradox, ſhew any ſuch difference between that Ceremony and theſe here inſtanced, as that Chriſt ſhould hate the one, and delight in the other. For that often alledged, that the *Phariſees* placed much Religion in their often Waſhings (beſides that the thing ſimply, not their opinion, is condemned in the place cited) it cannot be made out, that they placed more Religion in this, than they did in their *Poſtcœnium*, waſhing of Proſelytes, &c. For further Anſwer to this Aſſertion of our Authors, I add, that ſuppoſing Chriſt did make his Inſtitutions to conſiſt of ſome material acts, like to theſe of the Jewiſh uncommanded obſervations (for this is the furtheſt, that the Authors conſideration can pretend to prove) it doth not follow that he approved of theſe inventions: neither that we may mould the affairs of the Church by our Reaſon and skill without Scripture; and that for theſe Reaſons; 1. From Chriſts Wiſdom. 2. From his Authority which did warrant him to do ſuch things, and doth not make it lawful for the Church now to do them. 1. I ſay, from his Wiſdom; he is an able and competent Judg of what is ſuted to Goſpel-worſhip, and what not: and therefore of theſe unwarranted Obſervations in Uſe among the *Jews*, he could chuſe what was fitteſt for his deſigns (the things being indifferent in themſelves) and appoint them in his Church: we cannot ſo well judg of the fitneſs of a thing to his deſign in the Goſpel-model of affairs; and therefore muſt not take ſuch liberty in doing what Man hath done without a ſpecial inſtitution of Chriſt. Moreover, he knew well how in the depth of his Wiſdom to make ſuch a choice in his inſtitutions ſerve unto two great ends, *viz.* the gaining of the *Jews*, by making as little diffrrence between the old way (to which they were wedded) and the new Goſpel-way, as could be: and the adorning of his Goſpel-ſervice with moſt fit and excellent

Ceremonies: this cannot be pretended for devices of Men in Gods Worſhip, whether found out by themſelves, or wherein they imitate others. 2. For his Authority, however theſe Obſervations being uncommanded were on that account unlawful to the *Jews*; yet the things materially conſidered being indifferent, and Chriſt having abſolute Authority to inſtitute particulars in his Church, he might well chuſe theſe, and ſeal them with his Authority, and ſo make them both lawful and duty to us: this no Man can do; they muſt have his Command for Inſtitution; and not make them by their own authority. Wherefore Chriſt taking the Jewiſh Cuſtoms for Patterns to his Inſtitutions (if he did ſo) maketh nothing for Men's ſetting up their inſtitutions in the Church; or for the indifferency of things belonging peculiarly to the Church.

Sect. 5. That which he ſaith *ibid*: maketh little to his purpoſe, *viz.* 'That even when God did determine the poſitives of Worſhip, he left the Morals to the wiſdom and 'diſcretion of his People: which he inſtanceth in building 'and ruling Synagogues. Anſ. this is true of ſuch things as are of common concernment to Religion and other Actions; we alſo allow ſuch parts of Church-Government to be managed by Chriſtian Prudence: his inſtance proveth no more; for we permit alſo the building of Churches to prudence. But the queſtion is about things proper to the Church as it is a Religious Society: theſe things we deny to have been left to prudence among the Jews, or to be now ſo left among Chriſtians. I cannot yield to what he ſeemeth to aim at, when he ſaith, 'that though the reaſon of 'erecting Synagogues was builded on a command, *viz.* Of 'having holy Convocations, yet they were not built for a 'long time after they came to the Land: I cannot think that the building of Synagogues was indifferent though the place and manner was: for the ſame command that requireth holy Convocations, requireth that there be a place fit for them. If they were at firſt long of building, it was either from ſome impediment, or from inexcuſable negligence. Much leſs do I agree to what followeth, *viz.* 'Al-

'though

'though *Moſes* requireth the duty of Aſſembling, yet he 'preſcribes no Orders for the place of meeting, nor for the 'manner of ſpending theſe dayes in Gods ſervice, nor for 'the Perſons who were to ſuperintend the publick work. Anſ. the firſt of theſe, as to the Circumſtances of it, is left to Prudence, it being meerly a natural Circumſtance of Worſhip, the ſecond for ſubſtance is in the law, *viz.* What duties they ſhould ſpend the day with, *viz.* Sacrificing in the Temple, reading the Law, and Teaching the People in other places: the natural Circumſtances of this are alſo left to prudence. The third is falſly aſſerted: are not the *Levites* appointed to ſuperintend that work when they are made the Publick Teachers of the People? Wherefore all this maketh nothing for his deſign, *viz.* That the *Jewiſh* Church-Government was left to Prudence, and that the Chriſtian ſhould be ſo. Their reading of the Law we approve; but deny it to have been voluntary but commanded; their curious dividing of it, and leaving out ſome of it we diſprove, as the fruit of the ſuperſtitions of the latter ages of that Church: and indeed it may be compared with the frame of our Service-Book, though it was not ſo bad by far. I inſiſt not on his gueſſes about the Government of Synagogues, which he taketh much pains to make appear to be like the Government in the Apoſtolick Church, that he might make us believe, that this was taken from that. I only obſerve that the product of all his pains is not *operæ pretium*: both becauſe of the uncertainty of the matter of Fact, that there were ſuch Officers ſo employed in the Synagogues: as alſo the far off reſemblances that are between them and Officers in the Chriſtian Church; as any attentive Reader may obſerve. And ſo I paſs to *p.* 253. where he ſheweth how far the Apoſtles in forming Chriſtian Churches did follow the Jewiſh Pattern.

Sect. 6. I ſmile indeed to conſider how Mr. *Still.* magnifies this his notion, and judgeth this birth of his own Brain, as that which with his Improvement ('ſuch as it 'hath yet received from no other) will be more conducible 'than any he knoweth to the happy end of Compoſing our

'diffe-

'differences about Church-Government. I hope I have ſaid as much of this notion. *p.* 186. &c, as will make it to be of leſs eſteem with unbyaſſed men. I profeſs I cannot yet underſtand, for all that I have meet with in this Author about it, how this Notion ſhould have any ſuch effect; for the Queſtion is not what pattern the Apoſtles followed, ſo much, as whether what they did was the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and whether we ought to follow them as our pattern: and to the determining of this I ſee very little or no Uſe of this notion which he ſo much crieth up. But to make it get entertainment he taketh much pains. Firſt, he promiſeth ſome general conſiderations to make it probable: and ſheweth next how the Apoſtles did imitate the Synagogue in 4 particulars. Let us hear what probability it getteth from his Conſiderations. The 1 is, 'That Chriſt and his Diſciples, 'and Chriſtians afterward went under the name of *Jews*; 'that they kept Communion with the *Jews*, and obſerved 'their Cuſtomes, not only which were commanded of God, 'but which they had taken up themſelves, if they were not 'contrary to Gods commands. Here are 3 or 4 conſiderations jumbled together, ſome of which are falſe, others true, but prove not the Point. I ſhall anſwer them more diſtinctly than he hath ſet them down. And firſt for the name, it is no wonder they were called *Jews*, for they were ſo by nation: if at any time they owned themſelves as of the *Jewiſh* Religion, that proveth nothing; for this they might do, becauſe the *Jewiſh* Religion, as commanded of God, was the ſame in Subſtance with the Chriſtian, ſee *Act.* 26. 22. It doth not from this follow that there were the ſame Adminiſtrations in the *Jewiſh* and Chriſtian-Church. And if in after-times the Jews and Chriſtians were both reckoned as one body by the Heathens (for which he bringeth ſome proof *p.* 255. and 256.) yet it doth not follow, which he there inferreth, *viz.* That they obſerved the ſame Rites and Cuſtomes: for this miſtake of the Heathens did proceed partly from the agreement that was between Jews and Chriſtians, as to moſt great points of Religion: partly from the Agreement of their Rites in this, that both were very unlike

like the Heathen Rites. Neither did the Heathens understand the difference between Jews and Christians, though wise men among them knew that there was a difference: this may be gathered from *Act.* 18. 15. and *Act.* 25. 19, 20. It doth not follow from this, that the Rites were the same. 2. For their keeping communion with the Jews, this doth far less prove the point: and that because, 1. the time when they kept Communion with the Jews was when the Jewish Church was yet standing, and the Christian not framed nor erected: our Author cannot prove that they kept Communion with them after the Christian Churches were set up: for their going to the Temple and the Synagogues to Preach, proveth nothing. For that they did because the People were there met, not because they would join in their Service. 2. Because it was fit for that time to yield to the Jews so far as was possible, that they might be gained to the Gospel: hence they observed even some of the legal Ceremonies, they being then indifferent: but it followeth not that they did settle the ordinance and abiding practices of the Church by the Pattern of the Synagogue. *Paul's* being freely admitted into the Synagogue to Preach, proveth no more than we have granted: his condescending to them did procure this, not his framing Gospel-Churches according to their mould, much less is this his design proved by the mistake of the believing Jews about the conversion of the Gentiles, and their being zealous for observing the Law of *Moses*; yea and grant that they were zealous for the uncommanded Customes of their Father, as he alledgeth. For this proceeded from their being bred up in these things, and their Ignorance of the mind of God in abolishing them, and in calling of the Gentiles: and the Apostle's yielding to the Jews as far as might be for a time, was because he had not yet shewed the difference between the Gospel and Jewish Church, because they could not then bear it: but with what shaddow of consequence doth it follow from this that the Apostles did afterwards frame the Christian Church after the model of the Jewish? For the 3*d.* it is a bold and most false assertion,

that

that Christ and his Disciples conformed to the uncommanded Customes of the Jews: yea they are accused for Nonconformity in this point *Matth.* 15. 2. And Christ defendeth them in it, and meerly on this Account, that these customs were the traditions of men, and humane doctrines; which is true of all uncommanded Customes in Religion. But how proveth he this Assertion? he bringeth Instances, Christ observed the Feast of dedication: this is Impudently said; he walked in *Solomons* Porch *Jo.* 10. 22, 23. that he might have occasion to teach the People: but did he offer a Sacrifice, or observe any other rite or Custome of the Feast? we read no such thing, going to their Synagogues and teaching there was no uncommanded Custome. Washing the Disciples Feet a custom used by the Jews before the passover (saith Mr. *Still.* but others say it was done between the 2 courses of the passover) this Christ did, and giveth a Mystical reason for it. *Jo.* 13. 5. but that he did it in Conformity to the Jewish Custome ('if any such 'there was) let it be proved, appointing Baptism I hope 'hath a better Foundation than the Jewish Custome, but of this before; thus what he saith in prosecuting his First consideration, is answered: neither is it as yet probable that the Apostles imitated the Jewes in framing the Gospel-Church.

Sect. 7. His 2*d* consideration *p.* 257. is that the Apostles framed Christian Churches out of Jewish Synagogues: what solid Proof for this he bringeth let us hear. We see 'saith he, how fearful the Apostles were to offend the Jews, 'and how ready to condescend to them in any thing that 'might be; and if *Paul* would yield to them in circumci-'sing *Tim.* (a thing which might seem to cross the design 'of the Gospel) would he scruple to retain the old Model 'the Synagogue, when there was nothing in it repugnant 'to the doctrine of the Gospel? *Answ.* The Apostles at first did yield very far to the *Jews*, because they could not at the beginning digest the taking down of the old frame of Worship, and setting up a new; hence they did conform to the *Jews*, for that time, as much as might be in their transient and occasional practices: but this reason did no way

oblige

oblige them to frame their conſtitutions and practices of the Church that were to abide afterward, by the Jewiſh Patern, becauſe then the Goſpel was fully promulgated, and the Will of Chriſt known to the new Goſpel-Church, differing from the old; and in this caſe we are rather to think that the Apoſtles did not conform to the Jewiſh way in things not neceſſary; becauſe as at firſt, their work was to bring them to Chriſt, and ſo they yielded to them as much as might be; ſo afterwards now their work was to bring them from *Moſes*, and to this end it was fit to bring them off all thoſe cuſtomes and waies which might keep that their Idol yet in their minds, as ſure the Jewiſh cuſtomes might do; Here is more then a ſhew of reaſon (which our Author requireth) why the Apoſtle ſhould ſlight the conſtitution of the Jewiſh Synagogues; and beſides, it is reaſon enough why they ſhould do this, if it be not proved that they did otherwiſe, ſeeing they were guided by an infallible Spirit, not led by mens Cuſtomes in their Actions. I find no further proof of this conſideration, but that they did not only gather Churches out of Synagogues, but that in probability whole Synagogues in ſome places were converted. What ground there is for this probability I know not; we read nothing of it, as we read of whole Houſes converted: neither ſee I any reaſon to think that the Apoſtles did reſpect Synagogues in their reforming Churches: they made the Churches of them who had before been in the Synagogues; and that I believe they did according to the Peoples beſt conveniency for partaking of ordinances together: but that their Synagogues were their Pattern I ſee not. Another argument from the Jewiſh and Gentiles *Cætus*, he would fain be helped by; but finding it weak, diſputeth againſt it: wherefore we lay it aſide, and come to his 3*d* conſideration *p.* 260. *viz.* 'the Synagogue-Model was moſt agreable to the State 'of the Churches in Apoſtolick times; becauſe it was ſo 'ordered, as that it needed not depend on the Secular 'Power for attaining the end of Government. *Anſwer.* Wherein the Synagogue-Model was, in the nature of the thing fitted to the State of the Goſpel, we do not ſay that the Apoſtles would reject ſuch a good thing becauſe uſed

by

by the Synagogue; only we deny that they uſed it becauſe the Synagogue uſed it: ſo this proveth nothing. Further it proveth only co-incidency between the Church and Synagogue-Government in this general that both were ſuch as might conſiſt without Secular power: but divers particular forms may be of this nature; ſo that there is no need from this conſideration that the Church and the Synagogues be governed by the ſame Model.

Sect. 8. We ſee how probable he hath made this his aſſertion: he cometh *p.* 261. to ſhew what particular practices of the Synagogue, the Apoſtles did take up and follow; and firſt he ſpeaketh of their publick ſervice in the Church: where all that he can attain to is this, 'that there 'was in the Church, as there had been in the Synagogue, 'ſolemn Prayers, Praiſes, reading of Scripture, and teaching 'of the People out of it: all which are parts of Moral worſhip; and would have been in the Church though there had never been a Synagogue to take example by; he is forced to acknowledge a conſiderable difference, *viz.* 'omitting 'the reading the Sections of the Law as was done in the 'Synagogue, and celebrating the Lords Supper, which was 'not in it: which one conſideration deſtroyeth all that he is at ſo much pains to eſtabliſh: for if Chriſt and his Apoſtles had made the Synagogue their pattern, they might eaſily have conformed to them in reading the Sections of the Law and taking the Lords Supper, from ſome of their cuſtomes as well as they did Baptiſm, as this Author alledgeth. Next he cometh *p.* 264. to ordination: about which he maketh a great deal of do, but to no purpoſe: for Ordination *i. e.* a Solemn ſetting of men apart for the Office of the Miniſtry, doth naturally follow as neceſſary to Order; ſuppoſing that ſome ſhould be in that Office and the work be not common to all, which I believe ſhould have been in the Church whatever had been done in the Synagogue; as for the Rite of it; laying on of hands, whether it was uſed in the Synagogue or not is not worth our enquiry, for it will not thence follow that the Apoſtles took it from the confederate diſcipline of the Synagogue (*i. e.* from their

men

men-deviſed Cuſtomes) as our Author confidently aſſerteth: but all that he diſcourſeth proveth not this, but only, if it prove any thing, that it was uſed in the Synagogue. I aſſert with more warrant that it was taken up both by the Synagogue and by the Apoſtles from the ancient cuſtome of bleſſing, or dedicating any thing to God by this Ceremony: of this Judgment is *Calv. Inſt. lib. cap. 4. Sect. hunc autem ritum fluxiſſe arbitror ab Hebræorum more, qui quod benedictum aut conſecratum volebant, manuum impoſitione deo quaſi repræſentabant: ſic Jacob benedicens Ephraim & Manaſſe, eorum capitibus manus impoſuit: quod ſequutus eſt dominus noſter, cum ſuper infantes precationem faceret: eodem ut arbitror ſignificatu Judæi ex legis præſcripto ſuis ſacrificiis manus imponebant: quare apoſtoli per manuum impoſitionem eum ſe deo offerre ſignificabant quem initiabant in miniſterium: quanquam uſui ſit etiam ſuper eos, quibus viſibilis ſpiritus gratias conferebant.* We ſee then it was not the practice in Synagogue-Ordination only: but in many things elſe, and it is moſt probable that this Rite ſo conſtantly uſed in all Ages of the Church, in all caſes of bleſſing or conſecration hath ſomething more in it then humane Inſtitution in the Synagogue: the conſtant uſe of it by men infallibly guided, as *Abraham*, the Apoſtles, Chriſt himſelf; the commanding of it in the like caſe of conſecration under the Law cannot but give it a ſtamp of divine Authority. Yea we find the Levites thus ordained *Num.* 8. 10. wherefore all this his pains doth not prove that Goſpel-Ordinance was taken up from the humane cuſtome of the Synagogue. A few things in this his diſcourſe, I ſhall further ſhortly take notice of. *p.* 264, 265. he will have Goſpel-Miniſters not to ſucceed (no not by Analogie) 'to the Prieſts and Levites, but rather to the Officers in the 'Synagogues: for the Prieſts were not admitted by Solemn 'Ordination; but judged of their fitneſs, as to birth and 'body by the ſame ordination: but the Rulers of the Syna-'gogues were admitted by Ordination: and if any of the 'Prieſts came to that Office, they as well as others had their 'peculiar deſignation and appointment to it. Here I reply. 1. I believe that Goſpel-Miniſters did not properly ſucceed

to

to either of theſe; but ſtand upon another foundation, *viz.* Chriſts Inſtitution: and ſo it is needleſs to enquire which of them they ſhould ſucceed to. I yield alſo, that the name of Prieſts under the Goſpel hath brought in the thing it ſelf, and even the Maſs: which ought not to be. 2. What can he deſign by this Diſcourſe? Would he make the Office of the Miniſtry ſtand on no other bottom but imitation of the Synagogues Rulers; and theſe Rulers to be brought in by a confederate Diſcipline, *i. e.* to be a humane invention? If he ſay not this, he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe; but I hope he will not ſay it. 3. It is falſe, that the Prieſts were not ſolemnly ſet apart for their Office; though they had it by birth, yet they behoved to be ſolemnly initiated to it; and I am ſure Mr. *Still.* would not have ſaid, that they were no otherwiſe ſet apart but by the judgment of the *Sanhedrim*, of their birth and body; if he had not in this ſo conſulted Antiquity, as that he forgot to look into the Bible. I do not deny but there was ſuch a Judgment to paſs on them, (neither ought Miniſters be now admitted without tryal) yea the Scripture (which is ſurer than the *Talmud*) telleth us ſo much. *Ezr.*2.62,63. Yet we find alſo their ſolemn ſetting apart to the Office deſcribed, *Exod.*28.41. and 29. 1. *Lev.* 8. 2, &c. And ſpoken of, 2 *Chron.*26.18. Yea the very Idol-Prieſts would not want this ſolemn ſetting apart, 2 *Chron.*13,9. *Jud.*17.5,12. Yea, our Authors opinion everteth it ſelf; for to what purpoſe was a publick judging of them before their entry on the exerciſe of their Office, if there was no ſolemn admiſſion of them to it; ſure a ſolemn declaring them ſuch as God had appointed his Prieſts to be (if there had been no more, they being kept from exerciſing the Office till this was done) was a ſolemn admiſſion. 4. I would know who theſe others were who were Rulers of the Synagogue, and ſo Teachers of the people; at leaſt Superintenders over Gods publick Worſhip (as he elſwhere phraſeth it) beſide the Prieſts? if they were only Levites, or others alſo, as he ſeemeth to imply: and if any other but Prieſts and Levites were admitted to that Office, I would know *quo warranto:* ſure

the

the Scripture speaketh of these as old Testament-Teachers, *Neh.* 8. 9. 2 *Chron.* 17. 8, 9. and of none else, but immediately inspired Prophets. But I see Mr. *Stilling.* looketh more to Rabinical stories in these matters, than to the Bible: and to the customs of the Synagogue in the days of the Apostacy than to the commands of God, as he gave them, though they be rare who are made mad by too much Learning; yet there are whom too much reading (without holding to the Scripture as the Rule) maketh to dote. I need not insist on what he writeth, *p.* 268, &c. of the Rite of laying on of Hands; enough hath been said, to shew that it proveth not what he intendeth: nor on the persons ordaining in the Synagogue and in the Church; of which he, *pa.* 272, &c. for in both he confesseth abomination to have been done in common by those in Power; and afterward without divine Warrant restrained to one: if Christ hath given power to all Presbyters to do it; we must have some warrant to restrain this Power ere we dare do it; but of this enough before.

Sect. 9. In his further prosecuting the correspondence of the Apostolick Church with the Synagogue: he speaketh *p.* 285. of the Order setled by the Apostles in the Churches planted by them, for ruling of them: and first he maketh a work about the name πρεσβύτερος, which is the same with זקן used in the Synagogue; but from his own Discourse it's clear how little weight is to be laid on this consideration, as to what he intendeth: seeing that name was ever used to denote Power and Dignity, whether in Church or State, and so doth no more belong to the Synagogue than other things. I take notice of what he saith in the end of *p.* 286. If his design is not to dispute the Arguments of of either party, (*viz.* those who conceive the Apostles setled the Government of the Church in absolute purity, or else by Superiority and subordination among the setled Officers of the Church) but to lay down these principles, which may equally concern both, in order to accommodation. But I humbly conceive, it was very incumbent upon him to answer the arguments of both parties:

ties: and they muſt be anſwered to us before we be obliged to receive his Doctrine (of which anon) that we cannot know what form the Apoſtles ſetled, and that they ſetled not any one form. For as long as arguments brought by either of the controverting parties do ſtand untaken away; to prove that the Apoſtles ſetled this or that form; the Judgment can never acquieſce in his opinion, that they ſetled none; or that we cannot know what they ſetled. This is a ſtrange way of diſputing, eſpecially when the deſign is to ſatisfie the Conſcience in order to peace, and yielding up its opinion: to lay down ſuch Principles to this end, with ſtrong arguments ſtanding againſt them, untouched or anſwered. 'Tis like Mr. *Stilling.* thinketh that when he hath furniſhed Men with ſome probabilities, that may encourage them to comply with what Government ſhall be ſet up in the Church; their intereſt and maintenance ſhould reſiſt the ſtrength of all arguments againſt it: for he will furniſh them with no help in this; but they muſt have very pliable Conſciences, if Will be furniſhed to an opinion ſo maintained. His Principles in order to accommodation, or all that he will ſay of the Apoſtles Government, he draweth into 3 Propoſitions, *p.* 287. which in ſum are theſe: 'That we cannot know what was the 'Apoſtles practice: that it was not always the ſame: that 'whatever it was, we are not obliged to obſerve it. Let us 'hear how he maketh theſe out.

Sect. 10. His firſt Propoſitition he ſetteth down thus: 'That we cannot arrive to ſuch an abſolute certainty what 'courſe the Apoſtles took in governing Churches, as to infer 'from thence the only divine Right of that one form which 'the ſeveral parties imagine come neareſt to it. This Propoſition is not ſo ingenuouſly nor clearly ſet down as need were; wherefore I ſhall a little remove the miſt caſt on the Truth by his words, which may make ſimple Souls miſtake it. And 1. There is ſome ambiguity in [*abſolute certainty*] if he mean ſo much certainty as amounteth to Plerophory, and doth diſpell all degrees of darkneſs and doubting, this we aſſert, not that every one may attain (ſuch is the darkneſs

neſs of Mens minds (neither is it needful to this that we look upon what the Apoſtles did, as being *juris divini*. If we mean, ſo much certainty as doth incline the mind to the one part, and not leave it in ſuſpence: we aſſert, that this may be attained in reference to what is in Queſtion. 2. The matter in debate, is very obſcurely, if not fraudulently expreſſed by theſe words [*what courſe the Apoſtles took in governing Churches*] the Queſtion is not, whether we can know every thing that they did in this, (for many particulars are comprehended in this general expreſſion) but whether we can know if the ſetled Presbyters acting in Parity, or Biſhops acting with authority over Presbyters, as the ordinary Officers of the Church- 3. It is not fair dealing to imply (as this Propoſition doth) that we infer the only divine Right of one form from bare Apoſtolical practice: he knows that we walk upon other grounds, *viz.* we take Chriſts command of imitating the Apoſtles: the Parity between our caſe and theirs, which may make the morality of our practice to be the ſame with theirs. 4. It is not the one form which ſeveral parties imagine to come neareſt to Apoſtolical practice: but that which is proved to be really the ſame with it, we plead for: it's not mans imaginations, but Scriptural grounds which we eſtabliſh that correſpondency upon, we are aſſerting between Apoſtolical practice, and what we would have to be now in the Church. The antitheſis then which we maintain againſt this his Propoſition, is this, ' That they who ſearch the Scripture may ' come to be ſatisfied on good grounds, whether the Apo' ſtles in planting Churches did ſetle Presbyters acting in Pa' rity, or Biſhops ruling over Presbyters as their ordinary Of' ficers: ſo as they may (conſidering the duty laid on us to ' follow them, and the parity of our caſe with theirs) infer ' the divine Right of that one Form (of theſe two) which ' was uſed by the Apoſtles. For proof of this our antitheſis I refer to the conſideration laid down, *p.* 184, 185. about the perfection of Scripture-hiſtory, and its deſign to inſtruct us in this point: which doth ſo far prevail with me, that I look upon the Authors Propoſition as ſuch a reflexion on

Scripture, that any but a Papiſt may be aſhamed of. To this I add, that the arguments brought for Presbyterial Government by the Aſſertors of it, do evidently deſtroy the Authors Propoſition, and do eſtabliſh our Antitheſis: which ſeeing he doth not intend nor endeavour to anſwer, we need not inſiſt upon. A further confirmation of our Antitheſis, ſhall be to take off the arguments that he hath brought for his Propoſition, which I now come to.

Sect. 11. His firſt argument is, *p.*287. from the equivalency of the names and doubtfulneſs of their ſignification, from which the form of Government uſed in the new Teſtament, ſhould be determined. He ſaith, That it is 'hotly pleaded on both ſides, that the form of Government 'muſt be derived from the importance of the names [*Biſhop* 'and *Presbyter*] and that there can be no way to come to a determination what the certain ſenſe of theſe names is in Scripture. He maketh out the uncertainty, by laying down four opinions about the ſignification of theſe names: and from this variety of interpretation, inferreth that we cannot know what ſenſe they are to be taken in. *Anſ.* 1. when he ſaith that it is pleaded on both ſides, that the form of Government muſt be derived from the names of Biſhop and Presbyter; this is a miſrepreſentation; for 1. There be arguments from which it might well be derived, though theſe names ſhould never be mentioned. 2. When we diſpute from theſe Names, it is not from the bare force of the word; but from this, that the Scripture doth often apply theſe names to the ſame thing, never to divers Officers in the Church: and therefore, there is no ground for aſſerting the difference of Biſhop and Presbyter. This is a ſurer argument, than what can be drawn from the importance of Names. *Anſw.* 2. It is moſt falſe and injurious to the Spirit of God ſpeaking in his word, to ſay, that there can be no way to determine what is the certain ſenſe of theſe names in Scripture. We muſt then ſay, that the Spirit of God ſpeaketh that which cannot be underſtood, if he uſe names and words to expreſs ſome thing to us, and it is impoſſible to know what is meant by them. When we hear of Biſhops

ſhops and Presbyters in any place of Scripture; either we muſt ſay, that theſe words ſignifie nothing, or that they mean ſomewhat, but no man can know what it is, or that we may come to know what is meant by them. The former two are foul reflexions on the Author of holy Scripture: yea, it were a reflexion on a Man to ſpeak or write (in a Book deſigned for inſtruction) that which either hath no meaning, or ſuch as cannot be known. The 3d, contradicteth our Authors Aſſertion. His proof of the uncertainty of the ſignification of theſe Names, we have met with before in the like caſe: it is a moſt unhappy and inconſequential reaſon; Men have divers ways underſtood theſe words of the Holy Ghoſt, *Ergo*, they cannot be underſtood at all. They muſt have a meaning, and it is our duty to ſearch it out, however Men differ about it. There are better Reaſons brought by Presbyterians, to prove that theſe two Names ſignifie the ſame thing; which was incumbent on this Author to anſwer, and not to ſhift the matter with ſaying, that other Men think otherwiſe. I ſhall give but this inſtance, or hint, which may ſatisfie any what is the meaning of theſe words in Scripture. *Tit.* 2. The Apoſtle leaveth in *Crete Titus* to ordain Elders or Presbyters, *verſe* 5. and telleth him how they muſt be qualified, *verſe* 6 and giveth this reaſon, why they muſt have ſuch qualifications, *verſe* 7. for a Biſhop muſt be blameleſs: If a Biſhop were another thing than a Presbyter, to what purpoſe were this reaſon here brought? *Ergo*, they are one and the ſame thing. And if any affirm, that theſe words ſignifie different things in any place of Scripture, let him prove it, and we ſhall yield the cauſe. I might alſo ſhew, that the ſame Office and work is every where in Scripture laid on both theſe; and that never any thing is given to the one, but what is given to the other: but this hath been done, and other arguments managed fully by our Writers againſt Epiſcopacy; neither hath Mr. *Stilling.* had the confidence to anſwer them, though deſtroying this his Aſſertion, and therefore I ſhall ſuperſede this labour. For the name of [*Angels of the Churches*] the argument brought from it is not ours, but our oppoſites.

Sect. 12. His 2d. Argument for the uncertainty of Apoſtolical practice, *p.* 290. is, 'That the places of Scripture 'moſt in controverſie about the form of Government, may 'be without any incongruity underſtood of either of the 'different Forms, which he maketh out by going through the ſeveral places. The firſt is, *Acts* 11. 30. where it is ſaid, 'That the relief for the Brethren of *Judea* was ſent to 'the Elders. There is nothing here, ſaith he, to ſhew whe-'ther there were the local Elders of *Jeruſalem*, or the Bi-'ſhops of the ſeveral Churches of *Judea*. *Anſw.* I wonder why he ſhould have brought this as the firſt, or as one of theſe few Scriptures that he undertaketh to anſwer, (for, the moſt part of the moſt pungent Scriptures againſt his deſign, he doth not ſo much as mention) for, I think, it is very little inſiſted on by either party: nor can I remember that I have met with it, as brought to prove either Parity or imparity. Yet I do not doubt but at leaſt ſome probability may be hence brought, that the Apoſtolick Churches were governed by the Parity of Elders; for which I lay down briefly theſe grounds, First, The Elders here ſpoken of, are the Governors of the Church; this he doth not deny. 2dly, They were the Governors of the Church of *Jeruſalem*. This he ſaith, is not ſure; for they might be the Biſhops of the Churches of *Judea*. But againſt this I argue; 1. It is not enough to ſay, they might be; but what ground is there to think that they were the Biſhops of *Judea*, we bring probable grounds for what we aſſert; but what can be ſaid for the contrary? It is a bold way of expounding Scripture, to ſay ſuch a ſenſe it may have, when there is no ground to think that it hath ſuch a ſenſe; but ſome ground to the contrary. 2. However, the Relief ought to be ſent to all the Churches of *Judea*, yet it is delivered at *Jeruſalem* to be ſent abroad: for it is delivered to theſe Elders by *Barnabas* and *Paul*; whom it is not like they ſent through the ſeveral Churches of *Judea*: 'tis ſpoken of as one ſingle act of theirs, delivering the others to a company of Elders met together. Now it is not imaginable, that all the Biſhops of *Judea* were met together on this occaſion: for

what

what needed ſuch a Convention for receiving Alms? Yea, we have no ground to think that it was ſo natural to them before-hand, as that they could meet about it. Neither hath that conceit of ſome, any probability; that theſe Biſhops did reſide at *Jeruſalem*: ſuch Men did not begin ſo ſoon to ſlight their particular Charge, but of this after; Theſe Elders then were the Elders of *Jeruſalem*. 3. We find a company of Elders ordinarily at *Jeruſalem*, not only *Acts* 15.6. Which might be upon the ſolemn occaſion of the Council; but *Act.*21.18. That theſe were the Elders of *Judea*, come up with their flocks to keep the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt* (as Mr. *Still.* gueſſeth) is a moſt irrational conceit: for though many of the *Jews* were zealous of the Law; ſhall we think that the Apoſtles had ſet Teachers over them, who were no better inſtructed in the Goſpel than ſo? And beſides, theſe believing *Jews*, *ver.* 20 who are ſaid to be zealous of the Law, can neither be proved to have been then preſent at *Jeruſalem*; for they might hear of *Paul*'s condeſcendency to their Cuſtoms, though they were not there: neither that they were thoſe of the Country of *Judea*; they might be of *Jeruſalem* it ſelf: but I incline rather to the firſt. Now we find not any other company of all the Elders of *Judea* met in one place: theſe were then the Elders of *Jeruſalem*. 4. It is then obſerved, both by the ordinary gloſs, and by *Lyra* in *loc.* That this famine was mainly like to be in *Jeruſalem*: the Believers there being ſpoiled of their movable goods in the perſecution about *Stephen*; and therefore this Relief was chiefly to them: *Ergo*, they are the Elders of *Jeruſalem*, which here received it. Now from theſe grounds it eaſily followeth what we intend, *viz.* If there was a company of Elders who were Rulers of the Church at *Jeruſalem*: then this Church (of the reſt there is the ſame reaſon) was not governed by a Biſhop, but by Presbyters acting in Parity. It is ſtrange, if the Elders of the Church ſhould be ſpoken of, and no notice taken of My Lord Biſhop (if there were any ſuch perſon) in ſuch a matter.

Sect. 13. The 2*d* place is *Act.* 14. 23, 'when they had 'ordained' them Elders in every Church, to which he join-

'eth the 3d, *Tit.* 1. 5. that thou ſhouldeſt ordain Elders in 'every City. Of which places he ſaith that κατ' ἐκκλη-'σίαν and κατὰ πόλιν ſignifie no more but *Eccleſiatim* 'and *oppidatim*; ſo that the places may well be underſtood 'of ordaining one Elder in every Church and City, or of 'more, but doth not determine whether one or more were 'ordained in them. But granting all that he alledgeth, a ſtrong Argument for our purpoſe may be brought from theſe places, thus: there was at leaſt in every Church one Elder, in the Apoſtles times, and ſuch an Elder as was alſo a Biſhop and had governing Power over the Church, as appeareth by comparing *verſ.* 7. of *Tit.* 2. with this *verſ* 5. But there could not be in every Church a Dioceſan Biſhop ruling over Presbyters: for one of theſe are over many Churches, *Ergo*. The Church was then governed by the Elders of the ſeveral Churches acting in Parity: for if every Church had its Elder, or Elders, and theſe all were Rulers, then the Rule was not in the hand of one Superiour over many Churches. Nothing can be queſtioned in this Argument, except it be ſaid that every Church here is not every congregational but Dioceſan Church. But this can in no wiſe be, for there was a neceſſity of an Elder or Elders in every Congregational Church for the Peoples Inſtruction: if theſe then did rule, the Church was ruled by the Elders of Congregational Churches. 'The next place 'is *Act* 20. 17. And from *Miletus Paul* ſent and called 'the Elders of the Church. Theſe, ſay we, were Elders of the Church of *Epheſus*, to whom in common *Paul* committeth the ruling of the Church, *verſ.* 28. not to one Biſhop over the reſt, ſo that Church was governed by Parity of Elders. To this place he anſwereth by ſhewing ſome Probabilities for both meanings, *viz.* That theſe were the Elders of *Epheſus*; and that they were the Biſhops of *Aſia*: but taketh no pains to Anſwer what is ſaid on either hand, only concludeth, that becauſe there is probability on both hands there is no fixed truth on either; which is moſt deteſtable Scepticiſm: for if there be Arguments for both parts, ſure

both

both cannot be true, ſeeing they are contradictory, neither can both be falſe for the ſame reaſon, for *contradictoriarum altera ſemper eſt vera, altera ſemper eſt falſa:* then it was his part either to ſhew that neither of the arguments prove any thing, by anſwering to them, or to hold to the one as true, and not to hang between two. But I prove that theſe Elders were the Elders of *Epheſus*, not the Biſhops of *Aſia*. 1. (which Argument he mentioneth but he anſwereth not) the Article in the *Greek* maketh it clear it being demonſtratory doth apply his Speech to the Church which he had mentioned in particular: where when it's ſaid that he ſent to *Epheſus* and called for the Elders, τῆς ἐκκλησίας it might well be tranſlated [of that Church:] it pointeth out that Church and no other. It is an unheard of way of ſpeaking when a particular thing or perſon is mention'd, and the demonſtrative Article joined to it, that that Speech ſhould be underſtood of any other but that. 2. *Paul* ſent to *Epheſus* for theſe Elders, not through the ſeveral parts of *Aſia*. *Ergo.* They were at *Epheſus* not in other Churches. That he did not ſend through other places to gather them together is evident both becauſe the Text mentioneth ſending to *Epheſus*, not other places; and it is ſtrange if he ſent through all *Aſia* and mention be only made of ſending to one place not to any other: alſo becauſe *Paul* was then in haſt paſſing by them *verſ.* 16. wherefore 'tis not like that he could ſtay for the convening of a Synod of Biſhops from many remote parts. That which is alledged by ſome, that the Biſhops of *Aſia* did reſide at *Epheſus*, and thence were ſent for by *Paul*, is moſt abſurd; for 1. There is not the leaſt ſhaddow of reaſon to think that non reſidence of fixed Officers did ſo ſoon creep into the Church. Let us ſee any Inſtance or Warrant to think that any who had a fixed charge did leave it long, or often, or at all, but upon ſome weighty and extraordinary emergent. 2. What could be their buſineſs at *Epheſus*: their work lay elſewhere, and there they could do nothing except to meet and conſult about matters of common concerment: which will not infer ordinary reſidence there. 3. The work of theſe Elders

was

was particular inſpection over their Flocks; verſ. 28. [over all the Flock] which they could not have if they reſided at *Epheſus*, and had their charges lying up and down *Aſia*, for that probability which he bringeth for the contrary, it is none at all, *viz.* 'It is ſaid *verſ.* 18. That he had been with them 'at all Seaſons; but he was not all the time in *Epheſus*, but 'abroad in *Aſia* as *Act.* 19. 10, 22, 26. *Anſw.* [at all Seaſons] muſt not be taken in ſuch rigour as if he had never ſtirr'd a Foot out of *Epheſus*; but that he had his reſidence and Preached moſt there, which is evident from *Act.* 19. 1, 9. 10. he diſputed daily in the School of *Tyrannus*; this was at *Epheſus*: and it is ſaid that it continued 2 years, *i. e.* for the moſt part of the time he was there, and yet might ſometimes Preach elſewhere. For the humane Teſtimonies he bringeth for either part, I were then in the ſame ballance with him and ſhall be content to lay no ſtreſs upon them. As for the 1 *Tim.* 3 1. which is his other place, we make no Argument from it, but maintain that it ſpeaketh not of a Dioceſan Biſhop: let them who aſſert the contrary prove it. 'His diſcourſe *p.* 293. is a very unſavory comparing 'of ſome Philoſophical Problems which cannot well be de-'termined (and therefore we may heſitate about them) with points of truth revealed in Scripture; as if we might alſo be Sceptick in theſe. But ſure the Compariſon is miſerably lame, for 1. Theſe do not concerne our Faith or duty as theſe other do, and therefore there is much leſs hazard in Scepticiſm about the one than the other. 2. Even in thoſe points the motion of the Earth or Heaven, the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, there is ſome truth in them, though men through darkneſs cannot ſee it: neither muſt we ſay that nothing there is, becauſe there is nothing certain to us in theſe things; or that men may impoſe on our belief what they pleaſe in them: hence men are the more ſtudious in ſearching out theſe Secrets and give them not over as being deſtitute of all objective truth. But he dealeth worſe with the things of Church-Government; he will have no objective truth in it, and no duty to lye on us in ſearching out the truth, but that we muſt believe what men

ſay

ſay of it. For concluſion of what I would ſay to this ground of his Scepticiſm about Church-Government, I will but mention ſeveral Scriptures, on which the truth in this is built *viz.* That the Apoſtolick form was parity, which Mr. *Still.* hath not ſo much as touched: neither need I inſiſt on them, ſeeing Arguments from them are eſtabliſhed by our writers, and not enervated by him. One place is 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where *Tim.* is ſaid to be ordained by a Presbytery or company of Elders joyning with *Paul* in that Action: this could not have been if Elders had not had a Parity of Power. Another is, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5. where excommunication is tranſacted by the Authority of a Community, not of a ſingle Perſon: and ſo is the relaxing of that Sentence 2 *Cor.* 2. 8. 10. Alſo 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 12. They who ruled that Church, who were over them, and muſt be obeyed, were many; not one Perſon: yea that work and the work of labouring among the People and admoniſhing them are made to be the buſineſs of the ſame Perſons; which is a demonſtration that the Presbyters of that Church did rule in common and not a Biſhop over them. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. proveth alſo the ſame thing moſt clearly. Other places might be brought, but theſe Inſtances may ſhew that Mr. *Stilling.* undertaking to ſhew that no place in Scripture determineth what was the Form of Government in the Apoſtolick Church, doth not touch the moſt conſiderable places commonly brought to that purpoſe: but hath mentioned a few, and thoſe which are leaſt inſiſted on by them whom he oppoſeth; and even to them he hath ſaid nothing to ſcare any from uſing them as Arguments afterward. His third Argument for the uncertainty of the Primitive or Apoſtolical Form of Government, taken from the inſufficiency of the Teſtimony of Antiquity, is this; I paſs it, becauſe we have ground enough for the certainty of it from Scripture, and what he ſaith proveth no more but that antiquity is not ſufficient to bear witneſs to it: alſo becauſe all or moſt that he there diſcourſeth proveth that it cannot be gathered from ancient records that Epiſcopacy was the Apoſtolical form, which we willingly yield.

Sect.

Sect. 14. I come then to his 2*d* propoſition mentioned before, which he layeth down *p.* 322. Thus, 'That the 'Apoſtles in probability did not obſerve any one fixed courſe 'of ſetling the Government of Churches; but ſettled it 'according to the ſeveral circumſtances of places and Per-'ſons which they had to deal with. This aſſertion he lay-eth down *ex abundanti*, not as a Foundation of his opini-on but a doctrine of probability, which may tend to com-poſe differences about Church-Government. To clear our way in this diſpute with him, let it be obſerved, 1. That the queſtion being only about Parity and Imparity of Paſtors, all other differencies in Apoſtolick practices that may be alledged are impertinent to this purpoſe. 2. It helpeth not him, nor harmeth our cauſe, if we ſhould grant, that the Apoſtles did in ſome extraordinary caſes vary from their ordinary courſe: for it is what they did ordinarily, and where no extraordinary cauſe moved them to do otherwiſe, that we inquire about. 3. Our queſtion is not about the Government of the Church that was for a time exerciſed by extraordinary Officers immediately ſent of God: but what was the way the Apoſtles ſettled that the Church ſhould be governed in by her Ordinary and abiding Offi-cers. Wherefore it maketh nothing for his purpoſe if it be made out that the Church was ſome times governed one way by extraordinary Officers, at other times or places another way by ordinary Officers. Taking theſe conſide-rations along with us, I come to hear the Proofs of this his propoſition. The firſt is taken *p.* 323. from the different ſtate, condition and quantity of the Churches planted by the Apoſtles, and here he premiſeth 3 things, *viz.* 'That 'God did not give the Apoſtles equal ſucceſs of their Labours 'in all places, that a ſmall number of believers did not re-'quire the ſame number of Officers to Teach and Govern 'them that a greater Church did. 3. That the Apoſtles did 'ſettle Church-Officers according to the probability of in-'creaſe of Believers, and in order thereto, in ſome great pla-'ces. About theſe I ſhall not controvert with him; only the 2*d* muſt be underſtood with this diſtinction, elſe we can-

not

not grant it; that a fewer number, if formed into a Church-Society, though it did not need as great a number of Officers of every kind, as Teachers, Elders, Deacons; yet would it need as many ſorts of Officers; and the reaſon is becauſe all thoſe acts are needful to be done to them which muſt be done to greater Congregations: they muſt be taught, ruled, and their Poor cared for; and therefore they muſt not want any of theſe ſorts of Officers whoſe work theſe acts were: I mean where ſuch Officers could be had: for Chriſts Inſtitutions tye not to impoſſibilities. From theſe Premiſſes he inferreth theſe two concluſions to make out his propoſition; the firſt is *p.*325. 'That in Churches conſiſting of a ſmall 'number of believers where there was no great probabili-'ty of Increaſe afterwards, one ſingle Paſtor with Deacons 'under him were only conſtituted by the Apoſtles for the 'ruling of theſe Churches. On this concluſion (before I come to his Proofs of it) I ſhall make theſe remarques. 1. Here is nothing here for the Imparity of Presbyters, or the Authority of a Biſhop over Presbyters; if where more Presbyters could not be had, one was to do the work, this doth not at all ſay that the Apoſtles ever did, or that we may ſet one over the reſt, where many may be had to rule the Church. This concluſion then proveth nothing. 2. Theſe Deacons that here he ſpeaketh of either had ruling power or not: if he ſay the firſt I doubt, if he can prove that ever any ſuch Deacons were in the Apoſtolick Churches, where the Deacons work was to ſerve, not to rule that Church: and if they had ruling power they were not only Deacons but ruling Elders, both works being laid on the ſame Perſons for want of men to exerciſe them diſtinctly; which maketh nothing againſt Presbyterians. If the ſecond, firſt I queſtion if any inſtance can be given of a Church ſo conſtituted by the Apoſtles. 2. If it was ſo, it was neceſſity, not choice that made them be without ruling Elders.

Sect. 15. But how proveth he this his concluſion? by 3 or 4 Teſtimonies out of Clement, *Epiph.* and others. What? hath he ſo ſoon forgot himſelf? he had immediately before ſpent about 30 pages in proving that the Teſtimony

of

of the Fathers is not ſufficient to prove what was the Apoſtles Practice; and that by making out the defectiveneſs ambiguity, partiality and repugnancy of the Records of the ſucceeding Ages: it is ſtrange then that to prove this his aſſertion concerning Apoſtolick Practice, he ſhould bring no other Argument at all but ſuch as he had ſet that *Nigrum Theta* upon. Neither ſee I what thoſe Teſtimonies prove contrary to us. The Teſtimony of *Clement* ſaith no more than what is implyed, *Phil.* 1. 1. That the Apoſtles ordained Biſhops and Deacons: and our Author himſelf maintaineth that thoſe were not by their conſtitution any more than Presbyters: whatever they might after get by mens Inſtitution proveth not what was Apoſtolick conſtitution. For the Teſtimony of *Epiphanius* he confeſſeth its intricacie and obſcurity, and therefore (by his own Argument, of which before) it is not to be laid weight upon: but he taketh a great deal of pains to explain it and make it ſpeak this, in ſum: 'that at firſt there were only Biſhops and Deacons '(by Biſhops he meaneth Presbyters, as appears from his 'Subjoyning immediately that there was neceſſity for Pres-'byters and Deacons) and that by theſe all Eccleſiaſtical 'Offices might be performed: but afterward where there 'was need and there were found any worthy of it, there 'was a Biſhop appointed: but where there were not many 'to be Presbyters; they were content with a Biſhop and 'Deacons. Here are 3 caſes; Presbyters and Deacons; a Biſhop and Deacons; this in caſe of neceſſity where more Presbyters could not be had: this Biſhop, as hath been ſhewn before, could be nothing above a Presbyter; none of thoſe croſs our deſign: for the third, *viz.* a Biſhop ſet over Presbyters, firſt *Epiphanius* doth not ſay it was ſo appointed by the Apoſtles, but [it was done] it is like he meaneth by ſucceeding Ages. 2. He doth not ſay that this Biſhop was ſet over Presbyters with juriſdiction; he might be meerly a *preſes*, ſo there is nothing here to prove that the Apoſtles ever ſetled any thing contrary to Parity of Presbyters. The Teſtimony out of *Clem. Alexan.* even with *Salmaſius* his commentary proveth no more but that in

ſome

ſome places were more Presbyters, in ſome fewer, in ſome but one. His laſt Teſtimony ſaith nothing at all to the purpoſe: only that the Apoſtles ſettled things by degrees, not that ever they ſet up Biſhops.

Sect. 16. The 2d Concluſion that he inferreth, *p.* 332. 'That in Churches conſiſting of a multitude of Believers, or 'where there was a probability of a great increaſe by preach-'ing the Goſpel, the Apoſtles did ſettle a College of Preſ-'byters, whoſe Office was partly to govern the Church al-'ready formed, and partly to labour in converting more. This we cloſe with, and from it, and the former Concluſion which make up his whole Argument, infer the quite contrary to his deſign, *viz.* That the Apoſtles kept a moſt uniform courſe, (ſo far as neceſſity did permit) in ſetling the Government of Churches: and that they ſetled the Government in the hands of Presbyters acting in a Society where they could be had, and ſingly where more could not be: and that they never ſetled it in the hand of a Biſhop Ruling over Presbyters. All this is evident from what hath been ſaid. He taketh occaſion, *p.* 336, &c. to ſpeak againſt the Office of Ruling-Elders in the Church: in which Diſpute he toucheth not any (except one Scripture) of thoſe arguments which are brought by the Defenders of that Office: which is but a ſlight way of diſputing againſt any Opinion. It is not needful to our Deſign to handle this Debate fully, till that be anſwered which is writen by the Author of the Aſſertion of the Government of the Church of *Scotland*: by the Author of the Treatiſe of Ruling-Elders and Deacons: by the *London* Miniſters in their *jus divinum Reg. Eccleſ.* and in their Vindication of Preſ. Gov. by *Smect.* by *Calv. Juſt. lib.* 4. *c.* 4. ſect. 8. and *lib.* 4. *c.* 11. ſect. 6. by *Peter Martyr*, *Loc. com. claſſ.* 4. *c.* 1. *num.* 11. and many others. Wherefore I ſhall only anſwer what this Author hath ſaid againſt the Truth in this Point. Whereas among many other Scriptures proving this Office, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. is brought as one, there being implied there a diſtinction of Elders that Rule well, and are to be honoured with double Honour, into ſuch as labour in the Word and

Doctrine,

Doctrine, and another member of the distinction not expressed, which can be none else but Elders who rule and do not labour in the Word and Doctrine, *i. e.* whose Office it is only to Rule, not to Teach publickly, as Pastors. Of this Scripture he pretendeth to bring a full, clear and easie understanding, *viz.* 'That of the Elders that were ordained 'in great Churches, (who had power to discharge all Pa-'storal acts, but did not all attend equally the same part of 'the work) some did most attend the Ruling of the Flock 'already converted; others laboured most in converting 'others by Preaching; and that according to their several 'abilities: now these last deserved greater Honour, both 'because their burthen was greater, and their sufferings 'more. This is no new, though it be a false interpretation: for the Author of *Asser. Govern. Ch. of Scotl. p.* 48, 46. bringeth it as one of Dr. *Fields* Answers to the same place: or rather two of them which by our Author are put together. But against this exposition of the Text, I thus argue: 1. This Gloss supposeth that there were Elders, whose Office it was to Teach and to Rule: and yet they did ordinarily neglect the one part of this their work, and contented themselves with doing the other: Is it imaginable that the Lord allows any Honour at all upon such? and yet the Text alloweth double Honour, even on unpreaching Elders, though the Preachers have it more especially. This Reason is strongly enforced, if we consider that Church-Power communicated by Christ to the Officers of his house, is not only a Licence or Permission (as we noted before) but a charge of which they must give an account: as it is said of Church-rulers *Heb.* 13. 17. Neither do I see how any who by their Office are Preachers of the Gospel, can free themselves of that wherewith the Apostle chargeth himself, 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. Necessity is laid upon me, yea wo is unto me if I Preach not the Gospel; and of that charge laid on *Timothy* (who was as much taken up with ruling as any) 2 *Tim.* 4. 2. that he should Preach the word, be instant in Season, out of Season: May men when Christ hath put them in Office and given them a charge; choose what part

of

of the work of that Office and Charge they will do, and what not? But I perceive, this Man's principles lead him to ſubject all Chriſts Inſtitutions to Mens will, to cut and carve of them as they pleaſe: Chriſt hath given Paſtors a charge that they ſhould Teach and Rule his Church. He had pleaded before the Ruling-power may be taken from ſome, and laid on others; now he affirmeth the ſame of Teaching-power: this is intolerable boldneſs. 2. We have no better ground for judging of the diverſity of Officers in the Church, than by conſidering divers ſorts of work which ſome did ordinarily with the Lord's approbation, that others did not, but were employed in other work. What better Note can we have to know what is a Mans Office; than his work which he is ordinarily employed in, and that with God's own approbation? Wherefore, if ſome Elders Preached, others preached not, but Ruled; we muſt think that theſe were diſtinct Officers, and that their Office led them only to do what they did. 3. This learned Author ſhould have brought ſome reaſon for what he alledgeth, *viz.* That theſe unpreaching Eledrs, who Ruled, had power to preach; *αὐτὸς ἔφη*, ſhall not perſuade us of it: neither is there the leaſt ſhew of warrant for ſuch an Aſſertion. If it be ſaid that they preached ſometimes, and therefore could not be without Preaching-power. *Anſw.* It cannot be proved that there were any Officers in the Apoſtolick Church, who had Preaching-power, or did ſometimes Preach, and yet were ſo taken up with Ruling, that they did not ordinarily Preach. 4. We may with as much (yea the ſame) reaſon ſay, That every Officer in the Church had all Church-power, and might occaſionally exert it; though ſome according to their gift did ordinarily exert one part; others another: and that Deacons might preach, and do all the work of the Paſtors, though ordinarily, being better gifted for that, they ſerved Tables: but this is to jumble together what the Lord hath made an ordinary ſeparation of. 5. This Opinion maketh the different work that Church-Officers are employed in, not to proceed from diſtinct Office or Power, but from different gifts, which would bring a Babel of con-

 fuſion

fusion into the Church; For 1. As Men think they are gifted, so will they take up their Work; and so most will readily incline to the easiest work, and think their gift lieth that way, to the great neglect of the difficult and main business; and because Ruling is sweet to an ambitious mind, and laborious preaching is painful; we shall have abundance of Rulers, but few Teachers. 2. By the same reason one may neglect all the parts of his work, that he may neglect one: pretending that his gift is not for this, nor for that, and that they may be done by others. If it must be said, the Church must appoint them their work, and not leave it to their choice. *Answ.* If the Church appoint *Timothy's* work to be to Rule, and exempt him from preaching ordinarily; I see not how he differeth from the Ruling-Elders, which this Author disputeth against, notwithstanding his supposed power to Preach; which to him is an idle Talent (I mean, if this be done warrantably: otherwise it is not done) especially, if the Church give him no more power than Christ hath given to every Pastor, that is, to Rule over the flock with the equal concurrence of his fellow-Presbyters; not to rule over Presbyters by himself singly: for that they cannot give him this Power, I have before proved. 6. If the Elders that preach, because of the greatness of their work and sufferings, have more honour than they who only Rule; then the Bishop being of this last sort, must be inferiour in honour to those other Presbyters: especially this must hold in the opinion of this Author, who holdeth, That Bishop and Presbyter differ not *jure divino*: but this I suppose will not well please his Lordship and indeed is very unsuitable to the dignity of one who Ruleth over others: sure the dignity of Church-Officers is to be reckoned by the dignity of their place; where it is different: as it is by the discharge of their work where their place is the same.

Sect. 17. To strengthen this his Conceit, he brings a testimony out of *Chrysost.* affirming, that the ποιμένες καὶ διδάσκαλοι, the fixed Officers of particular Churches, 'who were κατὰ κώμας καὶ πολεῖς ἀφορισμένοι, were 'infe-

'inferiour to them, who preaching the Goſpel, travelled a-'broad into divers places. *Anſw.* This is not at all to the purpoſe: for they who ſo travelled abroad, were Evangeliſts; no fixed Officers: but of the former, the Apoſtle doth not at all ſpeak here; 'It rather appeareth (ſaith the 'Author, *Aſſer.* 1. *Gover. Ch. Scotl.*) that Elders were ordained in every City, there to abide with their particular charges, *Acts* 14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 5. He argueth alſo thus againſt Ruling-Elders: 'Theſe Elders are not the Biſhops 'Paul ſpeaketh of, 1 *Tim.* 3. For theſe muſt be διδακ-'τικοι, *verſe* 2. *l. Anſw.* The Author now cited, anſwereth this Argument brought by Dr. *Field*, and citeth *Beza*, anſwering to *Saravi* who had uſed it. Paſſing his firſt Anſwer, I make uſe of the 2d, which is *Beza*'s, That the Ruling-Elder, though he ought not to Teach publickly as a Paſtor, yet he ought to Teach privately, and occaſionally, according as the need of every one requireth: it is his part to overſee the manners of the people, and to bring miſcarriages to the Church to be cenſur'd; but firſt he is to labour to reclaim the Offender by private admonition, according to Chriſt's Rule, *Matth.* 18. 15, 16, 17. and that not only *ex charitate*, as every Chriſtian ought to do; but *virtute Officii* and authoritatively: and for this cauſe he ought to be a Man of Underſtanding above the common ſort, both able and willing to Teach (ſo the word beareth) ſo far as his place requireth. Again, he argueth from *Act.* 20. 28. 'All the Elders of *Epheſus* had a Paſtoral charge, 'for they are bid take heed to the Flock as Overſeers: but 'this is inconſiſtent with the Notion of a Lay-Elder, *Ergo*, 'there were none ſuch at *Epheſus*. *Anſw.* The Major is falſe: they had a charge and overſight: but every overſight is not Paſtoral. Ruling alſo falleth under this Notion, which is the Office of the Elder we plead for. He confeſſeth, *p.* 338. the weakneſs of that argument from Maintenance, which he ſaith 'brought *Blondel* quite off from 'Ruling-Elders, in that place of 1 *Tim.* 5 17. It is true, *Blondel de jur. Pleb. in Reg. Eccl. p* 77, &c. alledgeth, That theſe Elders are not there meant, becauſe Mainte-

'nance (implied in double Honour, as is clear from *ver.* 18. 'compared) is due to these, but not to Ruling-Elders. Yet the Argument, with all the enforcements of that learned Author, will not prove what he designeth. For 1. Some famous Interpreters understand this double Honour, only of a degree of Honour beyond these spoken of before, *viz.* Widows, so *Calv.* in *loc.* 2. How shall it be proved, that Maintenance is not due to Ruling-Elders, or the *seniores plebis*, as *Blondel* calleth them? His arguments taken from the disuse of it, will not conclude this: neither what he saith of the want of Power in any to remit it: for where it cannot be had for them, necessity excuseth the withholding of it: where it cannot be had, let the Inhauncers of Church-Rents answer for it, if such necessaries be not supplied to the Church: neither do I blame him for blaming (p. 83.) these Protestant Nations, who have cast out Abbacies which abounded in Riches, have rather taken the Revenues into the State-Treasury, than allowed it for such good Uses as this. I add for further answer out of *Asser. Gover. Ch. Scotl.* p. 105. That a stipend, though due, is not essential to the Office, either of Elders or Ministers; and therefore the want of the one, can be no argument against the other; But neither is *Blondel* against the Office of Ruling-Elders (though he deny them to be spoken of in 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. but disputeth strongly for it, yea, and groundeth it on the Apostles practice, *p.* 85, which is an evidence of Divine Right. The next thing Mr. *Stilling.* saith against Ruling-Elders, is, 'That if we remove from the 'Scripture to the Primitive Church, we shall find the great-'est difficulty to trace the footsteps of a Lay-Elder through 'the Records of Authority for the first 3 Centuries especi-'ally. *Answ.* 1. We look on the Scripture as a *surer Word of Prophecy*, and therefore are unwilling to pass from it, to that which Mr. *Stilling.* hath above proved, to be utterly so insufficient to determine in matters of Church-Government. 2. Others are of another mind than this Author. *Blondel. de jur. pleb. in Reg. Eccl. p.* 85. '*aliis igitur*, saith he, *firmamentis*, '*iis nimirum, qui nobis Apostolorum primamque per trium sæ-*

'*culorum*

'culorum periodum antiquitatis, praxin ſtravit, ſeniorum plebis 'Inſtitutio & functio (ut ſic dicam) vitæ à proteſtantibus 'per Gallias, Scotiam, Belgiam inſtituta ſtatuminanda eſt. And *Aſſer. Grov. Ch. Scot. par.* 1. *c.* 8, 9. Unpregnable and abundant Teſtimonies out of Antiquity are brought for this Office, which ſeeing Mr. *Stilling.* hath not Anſwered, it is needleſs to inſiſt on them. 3. But, and if in many places in the Primitive times this Office was diſuſed, it was their fault, and taken notice of by the better ſort. *Calv.* in 1 *Tim.*5.17. ſpeaking of this Office, ſaith, 'Hunc 'morem *Ambroſius abſoleviſſe conqueritur doctorum Ignavia, vel* 'potius ſuperbia dum ſoli volunt eminere. See Teſtimonies for the Antiquity of it. *Smect.* ſect. 15.

Sect. 18. His ſecond proof of his ſecond Propoſition, *viz.* That the Apoſtles took diverſe courſes in Ruling Churches, is *p.* 340. 'from the multitude of unfixed Of-'ficers reſiding in ſome places, who managed the affairs 'of the Church in chief, during their reſidence: ſuch were 'Apoſtles and Evangeliſts. In ſome places, ſaith he, theſe 'were, others not, and in ſome places no Officers but theſe. *Anſw.* This is obviated by our 3d Obſerv. For the Queſtion is only about Government by ordinary and abiding Officers, and that only where they could be had, of whom this proof doth not ſpeak. His 3d Proof, *ibid.* 'is from 'the different cuſtoms obſerved in the Church after the A-'poſtles times. This is moſt inconſequent: yea, one might as well reaſon thus: In after-times they ſet up Metropolitans, and at laſt a Pope, *Ergo*, it was ſo in the Apoſtles times. We ſay then, That diverſity in after Ages flowed from this; that Men (following Mr. *Stilling.* Principles) did not follow divine Inſtitution, or Apoſtolick practice, but their own Wit and Reaſon. Beſide, the diverſities he here inſtanceth in, are not to the purpoſe; for he doth not ſhew us that Parity was in one place, and imparity in another; but that in one place the Presbyters chuſed their Biſhop, in another not.

Sect. 19. We come at laſt to his 3*d* propoſition about Apoſtolick practice *p.* 341. *viz.* 'That a meer Apoſtolical

'practice being ſuppoſed, is not ſufficient of it ſelf for the 'founding of an unalterable and perpetual Rite for the Form 'of Government in the Church which is ſuppoſed to be 'founded on that Practice. This doctrine he laid down before *par.* 1 *c.* 1. *p.* 23. And we examined *p.* where I ſtated that queſtion far otherwiſe than he ſeemeth here to do, and indeed th s propoſition, as here laid down, might be yielded by us: neither doth it nor his Arguments for it touch the controverſie, which is *andabatarum more pugnare.* We lay no obligation on any by a meer Apoſtolical Practice; but by their Practice conſidered as done in the ſame caſe that we are in. Neither 2. do we ſay that ſuch practice is ſufficient of it ſelf to bind us, for it hath Gods command of Imitation, of which before; and equal Morality of that action to us and then to concur with it in this. Neither do we ſay. 3. That their Practice doth found a Riet: it doth but declare what is founded on the will of Chriſt as that which we muſt do. Moſt of all his Arguments are obviated by wh t is already ſaid. 'The firſt, that they did 'many things without intention of obliging others, as go-'ing abroad to Preach the Goſpel unprovided; *Pauls* not taking wages *&c.* This doth not touch the point, ſeeing theſe things were for a peculiar reaſon. To the ſame purpoſe is the 2*d* Argument *p.* 343. (which indeed is but the ſame Argument) that they did many things on particular 'occaſions, emergencies and circumſtances; as *Pauls* celebate, 'Community of goods, Preaching in private Houſes, Fields, *&c.* That which only is worth the noticing in this Argument is *p.* 344. 'That he requireth, before Apoſtolical 'Practice be obligations, that it be made appear, that what 'they did was not according as they ſaw reaſon depend-'ing on the ſeveral circumſtances of Time, place and per-'ſons, but from ſome unalterable Law of Chriſt. *Anſwer.* This we are able to prove, as to ruling the Churches by a Parity of Elders, for they did ordinarily ſo practice, and that where the place, perſons and times were not the ſame: neither can it be ſhewed that ever they did otherwiſe. *i. e.* ſet up a Biſhop over Presbyters: is not this ſufficient ground

to

to think that they did this not occaſionally but by a Law of Chriſt? His 3*d* Argument, is 'That the Office of Deaconeſ-'ſes is of Apoſtolick practice: and yet now laid aſide as not 'binding. *Anſwer.* 1. It is the opinion of ſome Learned men, as *Peter Martyr Loc. Com. claſ.* 4. *c.* 1. *num.* 11. and the Author of *Aſſer. Gov. Ch. Scot. par.* 1. *c.* 5. *p.* 38. (who citeth alſo *Aretius*) that though women might be taken into that part of the Office of the Deacon that concerneth caring for the Sick; yet men alſo might exerciſe it: which is gathered from *Ro.* 12. 8. ὁ ἐλεῶν he that ſheweth mercy, and 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. εἰ δέ τις though Widows be there ſpoken of, yet the beſt interpreters turn theſe words in the *maſculine gender*; and our tranſlation thus, If any provide not for his own Houſe; which they would not do if they thought that Widows only were they to whom that Office belonged. 2. Suppoſing them to be uſed in the Apoſtolick Church, there may be a peculiar reaſon for it: in thoſe dayes of perſecution many were ſtrangers, others caſt off by their Parents and Friends for the profeſſion of the truth: when ſuch were ſick, none could ſo well attend them as women: the caſe is not ſo now: and if it were, ſure this example might ſhew us our Duty. 4. If it can be proved to have been the conſtant Uſe of Apoſtolick Churches, and that with out ſuch extraordinary neceſſity; then the neglect of it is a great defect in the Church. 'His fourth Argu-'ment is, that ſome Apoſtolick rites and Cuſtomes are out of uſe, *Ergo*, their example doth not bind. He inſtanceth 'dipping in Baptiſm, love-Feaſts, community of goods, the 'Holy Kiſs. *Anſwer.* We deny the antecedent, being underſtood of Cuſtomes not built on a reaſon peculiar to them. His Inſtances prove nothing, dipping cannot be proved to have been only uſed, and if it were; to us it is not falſe, becauſe of the coldneſs of our Climate. We deny the love-Feaſts to have been *Apoſtolical*. Yea they are expreſly condemned as uſed in the Church 1 *Cor.* 11. 22. and if they were uſed elſewhere, it was a Civil Cuſtome, and ſo not falling in within the preſent debate. Kiſſing was the

Civil cuſtome in Salutation; this the Apoſtle 1 *Theſ.* 5. 26. would have them to uſe holily: neither can it be proved that ever it was religiouſly obſerved in the Apoſtolical Church. Community of goods was built on a peculiar reaſon, ſuting thoſe times of perſecution, and ſo not to the purpoſe. Whatever can be proved to be Apoſtolical and falleth not under the exceptions before mentioned, we ſhall bear the blame if we obſerve them not.

CHAP. VII.

THE Medium by which he here proveth the Form of Church-Government to be indifferent, is taken from the practice of the antient Churches in Ages ſucceeding that of the Apoſtles: he taketh much pains to prove that the Primitive Church did not conceive it ſelf obliged 'to obſerve one individual Form; 'but ſettled things as it 'judged them tend moſt to peace and edification, without 'any antecedent obligation binding to one courſe: and 'thence inferreth, that no certainty can be brought from 'their practice to prove one Form to be *juris divini*. We are not concerned here to enter the liſts with him: it ſhall be ſufficient to our purpoſe, to animadvert a few things in general. 1. It is no great matter if we yield him the concluſion, ſeeing we have ſufficient ground to build the divine Right of Presbyterial Government upon, in Scripture; and ſo may ſpare any Argument that may be brought for it from antiquity. 2. It is no wonder that the one Primitive and Apoſtolical yea, divine Form of Government was not every where ſtuck to in after ages: ſeeing the ambition of many men began ſoon to carry them beyond the boundaries Chriſt had ſet, to deviſe what might beſt ſuit their own humours, rather than what was for the Churches good: the Apoſtle telleth us that even in his daies (which was a wonder)

der) this Myſtery of iniquity had begun to work, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 7. It is no wonder then, that ſoon after it began to appear: and when ſome had thus miſcarried, and others ſtuck to the Apoſtolical frame of things, this might quickly breed a diverſity. 3. It will eaſily appear to any who readeth this Chap. that all the Authours diſcourſe tendeth to prove that the ancient Churches thought not Epiſcopacy to be *jure divino*; let them who are concerned anſwer him in this if they can; I am convinced of the truth of what he ſaith. But let us take a ſhort view of the grounds on which he eſtabliſheth what he aſſerteth in this Chap.

Sect. 2. The firſt is, 'That the extent of the Power of 'Church-Officers did increaſe meerly from the enlargment 'of the bounds of Churches: which he maketh out in 4 'ſteps or periods. The firſt is, when Churches were the ſame with Chriſtians in a whole City. And here he handleth 3 things, firſt he ſheweth that the Primitive conſtitution of Churches was in a Society of Chriſtians in the ſame City; 'where he will have the name [Church] in Scripture 'to be only given to that, not to a particuler congregation 'meeting in one place. I do not deny but the name is given as he ſaith, becauſe of that confederacy in diſcipline among divers congregations in one City: yet neither the name nor the nature of a Church muſt be denied to a ſingle congregation; for a Church in Scripture-Language is a company met together to ſerve God: now this agreeth well to a ſingle Congregation; ſeeing in it not only word and Sacraments are adminiſtred, but alſo diſcipline is exerciſed, as ſhall anon appear. All that he ſaith proveth the former Uſe of the word; but nothing againſt this latter. 2. He ſpeaketh of the Government of theſe Churches *p.* 352. 'And 'that 1. before Pariſhes, or diſtinct Congregations were 'ſettled. 2. after they were ſettled (about which he large-'ly diſputeth when it began, which is not to our purpoſe) 'in both caſes, he ſaith, they were ruled in common; and '*p.* 354. That it is a weak conceit to think that after the 'ſetling of Congregations, every one had a diſtinct Presby-'tery to rule it, and *p.* 356. this crumbling ſaith he, of

'Church-

'Church-Power into every Congregation is a thing abso-
'lutely disowned by the greatest and most Learned Patrons
'of Presbytery beyond the Seas, as may be seen in *Calv.*
'*Beza*, *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, *Gerson*, *Bucer* and others. I do readily yield to him, that it is most probable that in times of Persecution, particular congregations could not be soon settled: and that then, where there were in one City more Christians then could meet in one place, they were ruled only in Common, yea and had their meetings for worship occasionally as they could. Also we grant that when Congregations were settled, the several Congregrations in one City were ruled by one common Presbytery made up of the Officers of them all: but that they had not their distinct Presbyters that ruled them severally in subordination to this superior Presbyters we utterly deny; and I look upon it as a too supercilious assertion, to call this a weak conceit. seeing it is well known that it hath been the Judgment of men with whom, for ability, I think Mr. *Still.* modesty will not suffer him to compare himself. But what ever be of the ability of them who own it; there is reason for it so weighty, as may excuse it from weakness; which is this: Single Congregations meeting ordinarily together for the worship of God, cannot but have many affairs that do only concern them, not the other Churches or Congregations in the same City; as admission or exclusion of their members from the Lords Supper, rebuking them, consulting about the time and ordering of their Administration *&c.* 'Tis very unfit to bring all these things, in *prima instantia*, to the Presbytery that ruleth in common. This I confirm out of what himself hath written, *p.* 368. He saith 'that Country
'Churches had their own rulers who ruled them, though
'with subordination to those in the City: is there not the same reason why particular Congregations, though in City should have their Rulers? 'tis as really inconvenient to bring every matter of a City-Congregation, at the first hand, to the common Presbyters, as it is to bring the matters of a Country Parish to it. Yet we acknowledge that it is to be ordered according as it conduceth most to the good of

the

the Church: neither if we ſhould yield all that he ſaith, is it any thing againſt the Divine Right of Parity. What he ſaith of theſe worthy Divines diſowning this Power of particular Congregations, we have cauſe to ſuſpend our belief of it, till he bring ſome teſtimony of their own writings to prove it, which he hath not ſo much as eſſaid. It is like they were againſt Independent Power of Particular Congregations; not their ſubordinate Power: for the Teſtimonies that he bringeth they prove no more than what we have granted, *viz.* That the Congregations were ruled in common: not, that they had no particular Government in each of them; as any may eaſily ſee by conſidering them. Neither is it any wonder that the records of Antiquity ſpeak of the acts of thoſe greater, not of the leſſer and Congregational Presbyteries: ſeeing matters coming before the latter were of ſo private concernment; ſuch as uſe not often to be ſo much taken notice of. The 3*d* thing he ſpeaketh of in this firſt ſtep of the growth of Churches, is, 'what 'Relation the Churches in ſeveral Cities had one to another, and to the leſſer City, that were under them: and here he 'maintaineth that Metropolitans are not of Divine Right; to which we agree: I add, that in the firſt and more pure Primitive times they had no Being at all, as is clearly made out by *Dioel. Altar. Damaſc.* c. 2. Where he ſheweth that *Juſtine* and *Ireneus* have nothing of the different degrees of Biſhops: and that *Cyprian* in the middle of the third Century doth often aſſert their Parity. The ſecond ſtep is, *p.* 368. 'When Churches took in the Villages and Territo-'ries adjoining to that Citie: he ſaith, that the City-Pres-'byters did Preach in theſe places, and adjoined the Con-'verts to the City-Church. till after, when they were in-'creaſed in Villages they got peculiar Officers ſet over them, 'who did rule them, yet with ſubordination to the City-'Church. This laſt I only diſlike: neither do I ſee it proved by him, for the Titles of *matrix eccleſia, et Cathedra principalis* ſignifie no more but a greater dignity and primacy of Order, not of Juriſdiction. What he ſaith of that *Eulogie*, ſending abroad conſecrated pieces of bread, doth

not

not prove the point: and alſo it was a ſuperſtitious cuſtome: the bad improvement of it appeareth in the *Papiſh* adoration of their *Hoſtia*. His next ſtep is *p.* 372. 'When Churches did aſſociate in one Province: where he ſpeaketh of 'Provincial Synods once a year, and ſheweth that no Biſhop 'had power over another, but that their Honour depended 'on their Sees. Thence he cometh to the laſt ſtep, when 'the whole World became Chriſtians, and the Biſhops of '*Rome* and *Conſtantinople* did ſtrive for the place of Univerſal Biſhop. I hope it appeareth to any who conſider, that there is nothing yet ſaid by him which can overturn the Divine Rite of Parity, even to have been maintained in the Primitive times (I mean not of the laſt ſtep he ſpeaketh of, when Papacy it ſelf began to appear) for all that hath been ſaid ſheweth that Imparity was never judged of neceſſity; and that the Imparity which was uſed was rather of Order than of Juriſdiction, which is nothing againſt the Divine Rite of that Parity we plead for.

Sect. 3. His 2*d* Argument *p.* 374. is, 'That the ſame 'Form was not of old obſerved in all Churches: where he 'ſheweth that in many places, there were no Biſhops; as he 'proveth of *Scotland* and other places. This we accept of, 'and add, that where there were Biſhops, it is not, nor cannot be by him proved, that they had any Superior Juriſdiction, but only Precedency: and ſo the Divine Rite of Parity may ſtand for all this. His 3*d* Argument *p.* 377. is, 'That 'the Government of the Church was conform to the Civil 'Government, which he ſaith is inſiſted on by Learned Per'ſons on all ſides; eſpecially after the diviſion of the *Ro*'*man* Empire. And he giveth ſome Inſtances of it in the 'correſpondency of Civil Prefects and Arch-Biſhops in ſe'veral places. To all this let me ſay a few words. 1. This Argument deſtroyeth it ſelf: for in the firſt antiquity which was the ſureſt, the Powers of the World were not Chriſtian, and ſo the Church could not conform to the ſtate in her Offices. 2. It is here confeſſed, that this Conformity was eſpecially (I believe it may be ſaid *only*) after that diviſion of the *Roman* Empire: but thoſe were the times when the man

man of Sin had almoſt got into his chair; and therefore their practice can prove nothing of the mind of the Primitive Church. 3. If this notion hold, then it muſt be looked upon as a lawful and prudent expedient, that there be one Pope as there was one Emperor. This Mr. *Still.* muſt maintain, or he ſaith nothing. 4. If this was their Rite of old, then the Church behoved to be under two chief Biſhops when the Roman Emperor was divided into two. But this he doth not alledge, but rather ſheweth how it was divided into 13 Dioceſſes. 5. If we receive this opinion, then in a Kingdome there muſt be one head, who muſt have his Councel of Biſhops, without a charge of the ſeveral Dioceſſes (for the Kings Council hath not Precedency of ſeveral parts of the Country) and they muſt authorize their deputies, like Sheriffs, yearly *&c.* And in a Common-wealth there muſt be Independant Government: but this I hope the Author will not own. 6. It is moſt unreaſonable to ſay that the Church-Government ſhould be conform to the Civil; becauſe they are converſant about things and aim at ends ſo different: the one reſpecteth things that are moſt different in ſeveral Nations, *viz.* Mens Civil Intereſt, and Cuſtomes and Inclinations: the other reſpecteth that which ought to be every where the ſame, *viz.* Religion. His 4. Argument *p.* 379. is, 'That other Epiſ-'copal Government was ſettled in the Church, yet Presby-'terian Ordination was looked on as valid. This is not againſt us. His laſt Argument *p.* 382. is, 'That ſeveral 'reſtraints were laid on by Councils about the Obſervation 'of Rites and Cuſtomes and ſomething of Church-Diſci-'pline; but what is this I pray to Parity or Imparity? we are not againſt determinations of Indifferent things that concern order and decency: though we think that the Form of Government is determined by Chriſt, not left to the will of man.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

IN this Chapter our Author would make us believe, that all the world was ever of his Opinion: and indeed this is ſo common for men to alledg, whatever be their ſingular notions of things, that we are not to lay much weight upon it. *Videlius* took as much pains to make all reformed Divines to ſpeak for *Eraſtianiſm*. I might excuſe my ſelf from medling any further with this laſt Chapter of his. 1. From the needleſneſs of the thing; becauſe we do not build the Divine Right of Presbytery on mens Opinions, who we know can err, and therefore if all the world were againſt it, if the Scripture be for it ſo muſt we. 2. From the diſadvantage I lie under as to this part of the diſpute with him. If I had been of Mr. *Still.* opinion in this point in controverſie, I might through compliance with courſes have been furniſhed with a good Library and other conveniencies of ſtudying, the want of which doth incapacitate me to ſearch into the opinions of thoſe worthy men which he citeth: in doing whereof, I hope it would not be difficult to ſhew that ſome of their Teſtimonies are made to ſpeak otherwiſe than they thought; and others of them are irreconcilable with what themſelves have elſewhere written.

Sect. 2. Notwithſtanding we ſhall eſſay briefly to ſay as much to his allegations, as may take off that edge they ſeem to have, for cutting aſunder the cauſe which we maintain. *P.* 384. he hath a confident aſſertion. 'I 'believe, ſaith he, there will upon the moſt impartial 'ſurvey, ſcarce be one Church of the Reformation 'brought which doth embrace any form of Government, 'becauſe it looked upon that form as only neceſſary by 'an unalterable ſtanding Law: but every one took up

'that

'that form of Government which was judged moſt ſuta-
'ble to the ſtate and condition of the ſeveral Churches.
I wonder to ſee this ſo confidently aſſerted, without
proof. It had been incumbent on Mr. *Still.* for confirm-
ing this his dream, to have gone through the confeſſion
of the ſeveral reformed Churches; and let us ſee on
what ground they then built their Church-Government;
for it will not ſufficiently prove what was the judgment
of theſe Churches, that ſome eminent men in them did
aſſert ſuch things: which latter of the two he only in-
ſiſteth on, and that to little purpoſe too, as I hope ſhall
appear. But the falſehood of this Allegiance I will
make appear afterwards, when I have tried the ſtrength
of the Teſtimonies he bringeth for his opinions.

Sect. 3. He beginneth with them who have aſſerted
the mutability of the form of Government *in Theſi*
where he maketh it his chief buſineſs to ſhew, that the
Church of *England* of old was of this opinion. To
which I anſwer, That thoſe worthy men having no-
thing in their eye but Epiſcopacy; their work was to
oppoſe the Divine Right of that: there was never an
other form brought in competition with it, nor much
minded by them: and therefore we agree with them in
their deſign. Of Foreign Divines, his firſt Teſtimony
is of *Chemnitius*: to which I cannot give a particular
anſwer, becauſe not having his book I cannot try it:
only this conſideration I ſhall lay down, to take off the
ſtrength of it. Neither Mr. *Still.* nor any man elſe
ought to lay weight on this Teſtimoney to the purpoſe it
is brought for: for either he meaneth that the degrees
of Church-Officers in reſpect of precedency are left free,
or in reſpect of Juriſdiction: if the firſt, it is nothing
contrary to what we hold, for we acknowledg it indiffe-
rent, whether there be a ſtanding Precedent over Preſ-
bytery or not. If the ſecond, he is directly contrary to
Mr. *Stillingfleet*, who maintains, that the Church may
ſet up no new Officers but what Chriſt hath inſtituted;

as

as we have ſeen before: now an order of Officers with juriſdiction above what Chriſt hath inſtituted, cannot but be a ſort of Officers that he hath not inſtituted: wherefore Mr. *Still.* could not make uſe of this Teſtimony, neither ought any elſe, for it croſſeth the Scripture; which (*Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. *Epheſ.* 11, 1. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28.) doth on purpoſe enumerate the Officers of the Church in all their degrees. I diſpute not now what they are; but ſure they are not left at liberty; ſeeing the Lord hath ſo often declared his mind in this Point: to what purpoſe is it ſaid that the Lord hath in his Church ſuch and ſuch Officers; if men may at their pleaſure ſet theſe or others, more or fewer of them in the Church.

Sect. 4. His next Teſtimony is the *Centuriators* of *Magdeburge*, but it containeth an anſwer in its forehead, *viz.* That it ſpeaketh not to the thing; for they ſay no more but that it is neither Recorded, nor Commanded, how many Miniſters ſhould be in each Church; but that their may be more or fewer, according to the number of the Church. What is this to their parity or impatity? 'tis a token that he is very ſcant of Witneſſes, when he calleth in them who ſay ſo little to his purpoſe. The next Teſtimony is of *Zanchy*, which he maketh to ſpeak very fair for him: but he hath unhandſomly concealed that which is the Key to underſtand the meaning of this Author; for the Reader may evidently ſee his driſt, if he firſt look into *Sect.* 9. (*de Relig.* c. 25.) where he aſſerteth that Chriſt hath only given to his Church two ſorts of ordinary Teachers, *viz.* Paſtors and Doctors: the ſame he aſſerteth, *Sect.* 10. 'and yet '(which is his modeſty) he will not condemn the Fa-'thers who had other Orders of Officers: but what his 'meaning is, in this his condeſcendency, he explaineth '*Sect.* 11. That whereas in after Ages, one Paſtor was 'ſet over the reſt (*non ut Dominus, ſed ut Rector in Aca-'demia reliquis Collegis,*) this he thinketh was lawful, and yet ſetteth this note upon that practice in the ſame

Sect.

'Sect. 'Qua de re Hieronymi tum alibi, tum in Epist. 'ad Evagr. & in Commentar. Epist. ad Tit. c. 10. Nar-'ratio & sententia nobis probatur, dicentis totum hoc ma-'gis ex consuetudine quam ex dominicæ dispositionis ve-'ritate profectum esse. Which is as much as to say, He thought it rather somewhat tolerable through necessity, than allowable. Which small glance at the tolerableness of a Precedency in the Church (if it may pass for so much) was not well taken by other Worthy Divines; as appeareth by *Zanchius*'s own observations on this his Confession (which Mr. *Stilling.* taketh notice of, but passeth what might make against him) for, 'Magnus quidem vir, as *Zant.* calleth 'him: who was well satisfied with the rest of his Confession, excepteth this which he had said of the Arch-Bishops and Hierarchies, and that not only as what did dispease himself, but was unsutable to the harmony of confessions that the Protestant Churches were then drawing up: as appeareth by a part of an Epistle of that *Magnus vir*, to *Zan.* which he inserteth to the Preface to his Observations. So that it seems, this was generally disliked by Protestant Divines, contrary to what Mr. *Stilling.* would make us believe, *viz.* That all the Protestant Churches thought the form of Government indifferent. All which being laid together, let any then judg what great advantage Mr. *Stilling*'s cause hath received from this Testimony of *Zanchie*. Especially, if we consider with what Weapon *Zan.* defendeth this his Opinion, *viz.* 'That 'it was generally practised by the Ancient Church; 'and he would not take upon him to disallow them: 'as may be seen in his Observations on Chap. 25. of 'his Confessions. We see he bringeth no better Warrant than the practice of Men who might, and did in many things err. But Mr. *Stilling.* telleth us of the same Opinion of *Zan. de 4to præc. loc. 4. qu. 2. p. 943*, &c. and indeed he teacheth the same thing,

but with ſome advantage to our deſign: for, after he had made the ordinary Officers to be of three ſorts, *viz.* Paſtors, and Doctors, and Ruling-Elders (whoſe Office he proveth from Scripture, and aſſerteth as the Opinion of the Reformed Divines generally!) and Deacons: and had proved at length *p.* 950, 951, 952. Presbyters and Biſhops to be the ſame in Scripture: He ſheweth *p.* 952, 953. That in after-Ages one of the Presbyters was ſet over the reſt: but addeth, to qualifie it *p.* 953. '*Idcirco damnari hac, pia* '*vetuſtatis ordinatio & conſuetudo non poteſt, modo plus* '*ſibi authoritatis non uſurpet Epiſcopus quàm habent re-* '*liqui Miniſtri, ut recte monet Hieronymus.* Here he overturneth all Mr. *Stilling*'s deſign, for ſuch a Biſhop is but a meer Preſident. He thinks he hath gain'd another Teſtimony from M. *Bucer*, whom *Zan.* in thoſe his obſervations citeth: but Mr. *Stilling.* hath not told us wherein *Bucer* ſpeaketh to his purpoſe; wherefore take this account of *Bucer*'s Opinion out of *Zanch.* He citeth two large Teſtimonies of *Bucer:* the firſt is out of his Commentary on the *Epheſ.* where he ſpeaketh of ſeven kinds of Teaching, *viz.* 'By Read-'ing, Interpretation, Inſtruction, (*Doctrina*) Exhor-'tation, Catechiſms, Diſputing, private Admonition: 'from which he ſaith, That in the Ancient Church 'they brought in ſeven kinds of Teachers. Now what is this to the Parity or imparity of Miniſters? He ſpeaketh nothing here of ſetting a Lord-Biſhop over his Brethren, as a thing lawfully practiſed in the ancient Church. Yea, if we conſider his Diſcourſe well, we ſhall find that theſe were not divers Offices, but the work of the Paſtors divided among more, where there were many Officers in one Church: yet ſo as all might exerciſe all theſe Duties; and ſo here is no multiplication of Offices beyond Chriſt's Inſtitution. Though I do not deny, that this diſtributing of the work of Miniſters did afterwards be-

gin

gin to be looked upon, as making ſeveral orders of Officers: but this he doth not approve of. The ſecond Teſtimony of *Bucer* is out of his *de Diſcipl. Clerical.* The ſum of which is this (for the words are too long to be tranſcribed) That in the Ancient Church they ſet up a Biſhop among the Presbyters; '*Ut Conſul inter Senatores*, (this is devolving their Power into his hands, which Mr. *Still.* pleadeth for) That theſe Biſhops and Presbyters did meet when occaſion required, in Synods; that one was over the Synod to convocate and moderate it, (this is not to have Juriſdiction over the reſt) who was called *Metropolitan*, from the chief City, where he uſed to reſide: then over the Metropolitans were ſet up Patriarchs (but behold how careful he is to proteſt againſt imparity, as to Juriſdiction) of whom he ſaith, '*His tamen* '*Primatibus Epiſcopis nihil omnino juris erat in alios Epi*'*ſcopos aliaſve Eccleſias, ultra quod dixi cuique Metropolitæ* '*in Eccleſias atque Epiſcopos ſuæ provinciæ*: Which, we took notice before, was to convocate and moderate the Synod. At laſt he ſheweth how among theſe Patriarchs the Biſhop of *Rome* was ſet up as Chief: and then how all good Order went to ruine. Now let this Teſtimony be conſidered, and we ſhall hope for more advantage by it, than Mr. *Stilling.* could expect. From it we draw theſe two Concluſions: 1. That *Bucer* looked upon ſetting up a Precedent over Presbyters, as the greateſt length that the Primitive Church did or could go towards the making of imparity among Miniſters. 2. That even this their practice, though not unlawful in it ſelf; yet is ſo inconvenient, that it was the Method and Mean that Antichriſt got into his Chair by.

Sect. 5. He cometh next to the *French* Divines, and beginneth with *Fregevile*, whoſe Teſtimony we think not worth the Anſwering, ſeeing as Mr. *Still.* confeſſeth, he was Epiſcopal. His opinion did not ſuit well with the principles of that Church he lived in, as we ſhall ſee after. The

next is *Blondel*, that learned writer for Presbyters, as he is called: whose words cited by Mr. *Still.* are not at all to the purpose; as any may see at first view; seeing he saith no more, but, that it is in the Churches Power to make a perpetual Precedent or not. For *Bochartus* his opinion, that neither *Presbyterialis* nor *Episcopalis ordo* is *juris divini*: if he mean the difference between them in jurisdiction, and not only in Precedency: I see not how it can be defended, and not having his Book I cannot determine how consistent it is with his own principles. For *Amiraldus*, whom he bringeth next, his design of Union with the *Lutherans*, I believe, did either stretch his opinion or made him stretch his affections to an excess of condescendency; which cannot be excused but from his good Intention.

Sect. 6. Our Author cometh next to those who look on Parity as the Primitive Form, and yet allow Episcopacy as a very Lawful and usefull constitution. Concerning those, I premise 2 general Remarques. 1. That what these worthy Divines say to this purpose is to be understood, not of *Episcopus Princeps*, but *Præses*, according to that distinction very common among them. This we must hold as only consistent with their principles, till the contrary be proved out of their own writings. 2. That many things said by them to this purpose were the over reaches of their desire to be one with them who differed from them in this, but agreed in most things as the *Lutherans* and some English Divines: they did often (as *Smect.* saith of *Spanhem* to the same purpose, *p.* 65.) deliver a Complement rather than their Judgment. But to come to particulars: he beginneth with *Cracanthorp*, who excuseth all the Reformed Churches from *Aerianism*, because they held not Imparity to be unlawful. But this man was a Son of the Church of *England* (as they speak) and wrote in her defence against *Ant. de Domin.* wherefore his Testimony of the opinion of the Reformed Churches is not to be taken, being willing to have them all think as he did. They are better defend-

ed

ed from siding with *Aerius* by *Smect.* p. 79. where it is proved, that *Aerius* was condemned for his Arianism and other Errors, but not for holding the Divine Right of Parity: and that *Jerome*, *Augustus*, *Sedulius*, *Primatius*, *Chrisostome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* in this. Next he bringeth the *Augustane* confession: of the Testimony of which I have these 3 things to say. 1. This was not a confession of them who are ordinarily called the Reformed Churches; but of the *Lutherans*; for at the same meeting at *Augusta* did *Zuinglius* and the *Helvetians* give in their confession apart, by themselves: wherefore it is no wonder, if these worthy men, who were a reforming, but had not attained to that pitch of it which others had, did retain some small tincture of the way according to which they had been bred in this point. 2. *Luther* himself was not well pleased with this confession, as appeareth by the Relation of *Pezelius*, who (*Mellific. Histor.* par. 3. *p.* 336.) saith thus. '*Autor vero* '*confessionis cum Lutbero qui in Pontificiis concessum Stomacha-*'*batur confessionem rudem magis magisq; ne spiritum extingue-*'*ret, limabat, poliebat, et duriuscula, fermentumque vetus redo-*'*lentia expurgabat: via enim justi sicut aurora lucere pergit usque* '*ad meridiem, id quod ex ipsa apologia apparet.* 3. All that is said in this confession, is no more but an expression of their desire to conform and condescend to the Papists in the Primitive order of the Church: but this was no more but the Precedency of Bishops; the confession speaketh not of the Lordly power of Bishops as it then stood; that they could yield to that: so that even the furthest they go, in their complemental condescendency, doth not help Mr. *Still's* cause; who pleadeth for the sole jurisdiction of Bishops as lawful.

Sect. 7. In the next place, he is not ashamed to force *Calvin* to speak for the lawfulness of Episcopacy, which he could never comport with while he lived. He bringeth his Instit. *lib.* 4. *c.* 4. *sect.* 1. & 4. in both which Sections

he alledgeth no more out of him but this; That the ancient Bishops had almost nothing in their Canons which was beside the Word of God: and that they used no other form of Governing the Church, than was prescribed in the Word. What doth this help his Cause? The Ancient Bishops in *Calvins* judgment, were no more but *Præsides*: These, he saith, were not constituted beside the Word of God. This is nothing to the scope of our Authors Discourse. I hope after to shew that *Calvin* was far from His mind. At present let it suffice to observe, that the very words cited by *Mr. Still.* do make against him. For when *Calvin* saith, '*Si rem omisso vocabulo, intuemur, reperiemus* '*veteteres Episcopos non aliam regendæ ecclesiæ formam voluisse* '*fingere ab ea, quam deus verbo suo præscripsit*: It is not evident, that he supposeth God in his Word to have prescribed a form of Church-Government. And 2dly, That he asserteth, that the Ancient Bishops (if we look to the thing, and do not understand the name [*Bishop*] as now it is used for the Prelate) did stick close to this Form; What could be more directly against Mr. *Still*,? Neither is he more happy in the citing of *Beza* for him: for *Beza*'s distinction of Bishop is well known, 'in *Divinus*, i.e. Presbyter; '*Humanus*, i.e. &c. a President or constant Moderator; *&* *Diabolicus*, i. e. a Prelate with sole jurisdiction. The indifferency of the 2d he asserteth, and will not prescribe that Form used at *Geneva* (which was without such a fixed President) to other Churches: but what is this to the purpose? It is a pity to see a Learned Man at so much pains, and lose his labour. It being so as hath been shewed. Mr. *Still.* doth fouly misrepresent the state of the Controversie about Church-Government, that was between the Church of *England* and of *Geneva* in Queen *Elizabeths* time: it was not, as he alledgeth, whether Parity or Episcopacy were more convenient: but whether Prelacy putting sole jurisdiction in the hand of a Bishop, or giving him power over his Brethren, were lawful.

Sect. 8. Next he bringeth *George Prince* of *Anhalt*, *Luther*, *Melancton*, and *Calvin*, profeſſing their readineſs to ſubmit to Biſhops, if they would do the duty of Biſhops. All which amounts to no more than this, That if Biſhops would keep within bounds, not uſurp Authority over their Brethren, nor uſe it to the deſtruction of Religion, they might be born with; but this maketh nothing for the lawfulneſs of Prelacy, which theſe Men did ever deteſt. For *Jacobus Heerbrandus*, I am not acquainted with his Principles, nor his Book. *Hemingius* (who cometh next) ſpeaketh expreſly of *diſpares dignitatis ordines*, not *authoritatis*; and ſo cometh not up to the thing in Queſtion. For *Zepper* his judgment of the neceſſity of a Superintendent, it deſtroyeth our Authors Hypotheſis; for if it be neceſſary, it is not indifferent. If in any caſe ſuch a thing be neceſſary, it is in that caſe lawful, (*nam neceſſitas quicquid coegit defendit*) in other caſes it is unlawful. What he ſaith of Biſhops in ſome *Lutheran* Churches, as *Sweden*, *Denmark*, &c. doth not weigh with us, knowing that they err in greater matters alſo. What he ſaith of other Churches that have their *Præpoſiti* or *Seniores* enjoying the ſame power with Ancient Biſhops; proveth nothing of the lawfulneſs of Prelacy; We think their way lawful: and whether it be convenient to them, or not, we judg not; but to us, ſad experience hath proved it moſt inconvenient. The next thing that he inſiſteth on, *viz.* Epiſcopal Divines, holding Epiſcopacy not neceſſary, it doth not concern us to Anſwer, and ſo we ſee to what amounteth the ſtrength of theſe Teſtimonies, which he would fright us with, as if all Men were of his judgment.

Sect. 9. Having now ſeen of what force are our Authors Witneſſes, brought for the indifferency of the Form of Church-Government; let us ſee if there can be more pregnant Authority brought for the divine Right of it. I do not queſtion but many ſheets may be filled with pertinent

Citations to this purpoſe, by one better ſtored with Writings of our Reformed Divines, and having leiſure to ſearch them. I ſhall give ſome inſtances, ſuch as my poor Library doth afford, both of Churches and of particular Divines. And before the Reſtorers of the Truth, I ſhall mention thoſe famous Conſervators of it in the darkeſt times of Antichriſtianiſm, the *Waldenſes*, whom ſome of our Divines call *Majores Noſtros*: their Opinion in this may be ſeen in '*Waldenſiâ Confeſſ. Taboritarum per Joa. Lukawitz.* cap. 3. 'p. 5. *Lex evangelica Jeſu Chriſti--- per ſe ſufficientiſſima ad* 'regimen Eccleſiæ militantis, & c.14. p.32. *Nos qui pro lege* 'liberrima Jeſu Chriſti per ſe ſufficienti, ad regimen Eccleſiæ 'militantis, ſine Ceremoniis Legis veteris & ritibus humanis 'poſt adjectis, ſcientes, quia ſecuriſſimum eſt & optimum Ma- 'giſterium Eccleſiæ primitivæ, quam regebant Apoſtoli, actus 'imitari. We ſee here the ſufficiency of Scripture for Church-Government aſſerted, and that without new Laws or humane devices; which could not be if the particular Form were not determined in it, but left to Mens deviſing: Alſo, that Apoſtolick practice is in this a Rule to us; both which militate againſt Mr. *Stilling*'s Diſcourſe. I ſhall next bring the opinion of the *French* and the *Dutch* Churches, held forth in their Confeſſions: which I have out of *Smect. ſect.* 14. The *French* Church Artic. 29. 30. ſpeaketh thus: 'Credimus veram Eccleſiam gubernari debere, eâ politiâ quam 'dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus ſancivit (then it may not be 'ſuch as Men think fit, nor is it indifferent) ita, viz. aut 'ſui in ea Paſtores, Presbyteri, ſive ſeniores & Diaconi (then 'Chriſts inſtitution is againſt Bishops, ſeeing he appointeth 'the reſt, and leaveth them out) ut doctrinæ puritas re- 'tineatur. Credimus omnes Paſtores ubicunque collocati ſint, 'eadem & æquali poteſtate inter ſe eſſe præditos (then there 'can be no imparity of power) ſub uno illo capite & ſolo 'univerſali Epiſcopo Jeſu Chriſti. The *Dutch* Church, Art. 30. thus: 'Credimus veram hanc Eccleſiam debere regi ac gu- 'bernari, ſpirituali illa politia quam nos deus ipſe in verbo 'ſuo edocuit, ita ut ſint in ea Paſtores ac Miniſtri, qui purè

&

'& concionentur & ſacramenta adminiſtrent, ſint etiam ſenio-
'res & Diaconi, qui Eccleſiæ ſenatum conſtituant; ut his ve-
'luti mediis vera Religio conſervari, homineſque vitiis dediti
'ſpiritualiter corripi, & emendari poſſint. Tunc enim rite
'& ordinate omnia fiunt in Eccleſiâ, cum viri fideles & pii
'ad ejus gubernationem deliguntur, juxta Pauli præſcriptum
'1 Tim. 3. cæterum ubicunque locorum ſint verbi Dei Mini-
'ſtri, eandem atque æqualem omnes habent tum poteſtatem
'tum authoritatem: ut qui ſint æquè omnes Chriſti unici illius
'univerſalis Epiſcopi & capitis Eccleſiæ Miniſtri. What hath ever been the opinion of the Church of *Scotland* about the Divine Right of Presbyterial Government, is ſo well known, that I need not mention it: alſo what hath been the judgment of the Presbyterian Miniſters of *England*, both in the National Synod of famous memory, and the Provincial Aſſembly of *London*, who have written for the *jus divinum* of it.

Sect. 10. To this Truth alſo, the famous Profeſſors of *London* bear their joint Teſtimony. *Synopſ. Pur. Theol. Diſp.* 48. *Theſ.* 23. 'Nec tamen propterea concedimus à ſolo aliquo
'Epiſcopo, ſive Romano, ſive Eugobino, ex motu proprio aut ple-
'naria authoritate, ut loquimur, hanc poteſtatem poſſe vendicari:
'ſed rectorum ac Presbyterorum Eccleſiæ, concilium, totiuſq; adeo
'Eccleſiæ aut apertum, aut tacitum conſenſum, adhibendum eſſe;
'ex præſcripto Chriſti ac purioris Eccleſiæ praxi aſſerimus. And this they prove, Theſ. 24. Becauſe that [*Tell the Church*] cannot be underſtood of one Biſhop. *Calvin* is clear for us; for he maketh the Officers of the Church to be by Chriſts Inſtitution; and ſheweth who they are that he hath Inſtituted. *Inſtit. lib.* 4. *c.* 3. *ſect.* 4. Alſo, *c.* 4. *ſect.* 1. He ſheweth how in the Primitive Church, they ſtudied carefully to adhere to God's Inſtitution in the Government of the Church. And on *Phil.* 1.1. reproving the Uſurpation of Biſhops, he ſaith, 'Perinde ac ſi non omnes Presbyteri Collegæ eſſent ad eandem
'vocati functionem, unus ſibi, prætextu novæ appellationis do-
'minium in alios arripuit.

Sect. 11. I close with a short Answer (such as it deserveth) to his last Assault; which is *p.* 416. 'If Prudence 'must be used in setling Church-Government, as he saith 'is confessed by *Independents* in their Elective Synods: by '*Presbyterians* in their subordination of Courts, Classical-'Assemblies: Episcopal Men in several things. *Ans.* All this is nothing of the particular Form of Government, Parity or imparity, and so nothing to the purpose. We absolutely deny that That is to be setled by Prudence; but by the Institution of Christ; though many Circumstances in Government must be determined by Prudence, guided by Scripture-light. For his advice in order to Peace, it containeth many good things; yet cannot we fully close with it, till he establish on better grounds than we have yet seen, the Basis of it, *viz.* The indifferency of the particular Form of Church-Government,

FINIS.